



# THE AMERICAN

## A NATIONAL JOURNAL

VOL. XXVI—No. 659

PHILADELPHIA, SATURDAY, MARCH 20, 1897

PRICE FIVE CENTS

### THE AMERICAN.

A NATIONAL JOURNAL.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY ON EACH SATURDAY.

[Entered at the Post Office at Philadelphia as matter of the second class.]

BARKER PUBLISHING COMPANY, PROPRIETORS.

WHARTON BARKER, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

BUSINESS AND EDITORIAL OFFICES,

Rooms 24 and 26

Forrest Building, No. 119 South Fourth Street, Philadelphia.

#### SUBSCRIPTIONS AND ADVERTISING.

Subscription, \$2.00 per annum. Subscribers must notify us when they wish to discontinue.

Advertising rates for short or long time furnished on application.

Specimen copies sent on application.

A copy will be sent free to each advertiser during the continuance of his advertisement.

CHECKS, POSTAL ORDERS, ETC., should be drawn to order of BARKER PUBLISHING COMPANY.

\*Address through Post Office: THE AMERICAN, Box 1202, Philadelphia.

#### CONTENTS OF THIS ISSUE.

	PAGE
Notes of the Week . . . . .	177
EDITORIALS:	
The President's Message . . . . .	180
The Dingley Tariff and the Farmer . . . . .	182
The Dingley Tariff and the Manufacturer . . . . .	184
Protect the Manufacturer—Let the Farmer Shift for Himself . . . . .	185
Women's Ways . . . . .	186
A Word With the Doctor . . . . .	187
The European War Cloud . . . . .	187
Words of Wisdom . . . . .	188
Book Reviews . . . . .	189
Briefer Notices . . . . .	189
About Books and Writers . . . . .	190
Notes and Queries for Those Who Travel . . . . .	192

#### NOTES OF THE WEEK.

WITH the assembling of the Fifty-fifth Congress in extraordinary session, many new faces have been brought into the arena of national politics. The complexion of the House of Representatives is much changed, many faces are missing, many new and untried men have found their way into the halls of Congress for the first time. Of the 357 members of the representative branch of the Fifty-fifth Congress, 148 were not members of the Fifty-fourth, 132 never sat in Congress before. The Republicans control the House, as they did in the last Congress; but their majority has been cut down by a hundred votes. In the Fifty-fourth Congress they had a majority of 150, now they can count on a majority of but fifty. Half a hundred Republicans who sat in the Fifty-fourth Congress have been left at home; their places have been taken by Democrats and Populists.

Still, the Republicans have a majority that is ample for all purposes, if it can be kept in hand. But here comes in the rub. On nothing but tariff legislation is the Republican majority compact. On questions of monetary reform there is wide variance of opinion. There are men who would destroy the greenbacks, there are men who revere the very name; there are some instant

that the Government surrender the power to issue and control our paper currency to the banks, there are others strenuously opposed to such programme; there are some who speak of our currency as redundant, and point to contraction as a remedy for our ills; there are others who will not hear of contraction. And so it is that the contractionists will find the Republican majority in the House far too small, when they come to urge their schemes of monetary reform. There are not more than two Democrats in the House that are at all in sympathy with the gold contractionists, and so it is that twenty-five Republicans out of sympathy, and we are inclined to believe there are several times that number, can defeat all open efforts tending towards contraction and the conferring upon the banks of a currency monopoly.

ALONG with all the new members who have yet to make their place and gain national repute, the meeting of the Fifty-fifth Congress brings back two notable figures into national politics. In the Republican landslide of 1894, many Democrats who had served their party in Congress for almost a lifetime, were relegated into private life. Among those who failed of election were Bland, of Missouri, he of the Bland dollar fame, and Holman, of Indiana, familiarly known as watch-dog, from his ceaseless watchings over the public funds, and his constant efforts to pare down appropriations. Both these men now find their way back into Congress, and again we may hear the voice of Bland ever advocating the remonetization of silver, and the warning of Holman against the squandering of the public funds. By party friends and opponents alike, these men will be welcomed back to Congress. Great men they are not, born leaders of men they are not, they have their shortcomings, but their honesty of purpose no man can impugn. Both wedded too closely to their hobbies, their usefulness outside their chosen lines is somewhat impaired, but they cut before and they will cut again a swath of usefulness. Bland, especially, is a man of one idea, with the result that the view he takes of questions, kindred even to that uppermost in his mind, is somewhat cramped. The question that he has studied, too greatly, we fear, to the exclusion of others, is a great one, its ramifications lead everywhere. But there are questions that should naturally be joined to monetary reform, and silver remonetization is not the beginning and the end of monetary reform.

The efforts to monopolize our money, are not the only efforts making to enslave our people. We are threatened equally with a monopolization of the arteries of commerce, our railroads and telegraphs. A just Government must protect its people from monopoly. Its first duty is to see that all men shall have an equal chance to the enjoyment of this world's good. Every man is entitled to the enjoyment of the fruits of his toil; the man with greatest energy, greatest productive ability, should enjoy to the fullest the fruits of his toil, he is entitled to more than his less energetic neighbor, but no man is entitled, because of craft and cunningness to prey on the fruits of others' labor.

So it is the bounden duty of a Republican Government

founded on the principle that all men have a right to life, work and the pursuit of happiness, to overthrow monopolies, whether they be organized to monopolize production, arteries of distribution, or the issue of money. And as, under private control and ownership, our railroads and telegraphs have fallen into the hands of those who use them to despoil producers of the fruits of their toil on the one hand and investors of their savings on the other, the Government must assume the place, control and ownership that corporations, guided by selfishness, have proven themselves unfit to fill. Our Government must take the control and ownership of our railroads and telegraphs, just as it must conserve the issue and control over our currency in order to protect our people against the evils of monopoly.

THE House, unwieldy, but wielded by a stern and master-hand, lost no time after coming to order on Monday last in getting down to the task allotted it. Mr. Reed, undeniably able and a model man for the work at hand, selected to fill his old place by the Republican caucus of the Saturday previous, without a dissenting voice, was promptly chosen as Speaker. Thus was a power continued in Mr. Reed's hands only second to that of the President. In the shaping of legislation no man has so much power as the Speaker. He can negative legislation by a mere refusal to allow a measure to be brought before the House as effectually as can the President by an exercise of veto power. So again has Mr. Reed been made the ruler of Republican destinies in the House. That he will unswervingly drive the House to the task he allots for it cannot be doubted.

The Democrats, owing to the death of Mr. Crisp, found themselves leaderless. A new leader they had to choose. The choice narrowed down between Bailey, of Texas, and McMillan, of Tennessee, Mr. McMillan standing for those Democrats who would hold the party back with Mr. Bryan to one issue, Mr. Bailey for a more progressive programme. Mr. Bailey did not take kindly to Mr. Bryan's nomination, he regarded it as a mistake, and events proved him to be right. The friends of Mr. McMillan strove to make capital of this, but the young, eloquent and forceful Bailey was chosen as the leader of his party in the House.

That he will fill Mr. Crisp's place with ability we do not doubt, that he will appear diminutive in the place of his predecessor we do not believe. We hope he will rise superior to Mr. Crisp. It is not impossible for him to do so, for Mr. Crisp, able parliamentarian and debator, beloved by his party friends and respected by his opponents as he was, lacked the great quality of leadership. His party led him rather than he his party. The courage and decision that fits men for leadership we trust is Mr. Bailey's, and we cannot but hope that he will lead his party along a progressive programme not bounded by partisanship.

As we have said, the House has lost no time in getting down to its allotted task. So far, only one task has been allotted to it, that of tariff, and this, we are told, must be disposed of before the House will be permitted to do anything else. And even after it has disposed of this task, it is not at all certain that any other tasks will be allotted to it. Indeed, it is hinted that the programme for the House, after passing the tariff and sending it up to the Senate, is to meet only every third day, as it must in accordance with constitutional requirements, and then for the mere purpose of adjourning over another three-day period. There are, indeed, the several appropriation bills that failed to become law during the last session, that must be passed, but these, we are told, are to be passed perfunctorily, under special order and without debate, in the identical form that they were passed by the Fifty-fourth Congress. Thus the need of reference to committees would be obviated and Mr. Reed released from the necessity of appointing the several appropriation committees at this session. This he seems to desire, wanting to hold the

House and Congress down to the one piece of legislation on the Republican programme, namely, the tariff. He does not want to open the way to general legislation.

Over the one task allotted to it, the House is losing no time. The assembling of the House, the voting for speaker, the swearing in of the members, was scarcely over before Mr. Dingley introduced his tariff bill, which is number one on the House calendar. He did not even wait for the reading of the President's message. The bill was at once referred to the Ways and Means Committee to give the Democratic members a chance to glance hastily over it and prepare, no less hastily, a minority report. On Friday the bill was reported back to the House; debate will be limited to ten days or two weeks, and then it will be passed and sent up to the Senate practically in the shape, if not exactly the form, in which it has been reported by the Ways and Means Committee.

SO LONG as it is in the House the tariff bill will have plain sailing, for a minority in the House is powerless in the shaping of legislation. But when it gets over to the Senate the tariff bill will not have such smooth sailing. It will be subjected to a full debate and searching examination, and where it is shown to be a monopoly tariff, amendments will be offered and debated. A tariff framed so as to extend protection to monopolies and trusts organized to repress competition, arbitrarily advance prices and depress wages, is false to the protective theory. This will be made clear. As Senator Pettigrew pointedly said, in an interview of a few days since: "The argument for the protective tariff has been that by its assistance we would build up American manufactories and obtain their products at lower prices. This result cannot be brought about if we allow trusts to be formed, and thus maintain prices to the limit of the tariff."

In short, the formation of trusts and monopolies defeats the purpose of protection which is to engender home competition. The stifling of this competition is the purpose of trusts and combinations. Therefore a true protective measure must eradicate trusts and monopolies, and all real protectionists, protectionists from principle, not from selfish interest, should lend their aid to this end. Now, for the accomplishment of this end, Senator Pettigrew proposes a general and admirable amendment to the tariff bill that should command universal support among protectionists and free-traders alike. The amendment he intends to offer will provide that all articles in the dutiable list of the Dingley Bill, the production of which are monopolized or controlled by American trusts, shall be admitted free of duty, the importers of such articles being empowered to prosecute their claim for free entry in the district courts. "The chief difficulty, of course, about the enforcement of such a provision, is," adds Senator Pettigrew, "the method by which it shall be determined whether a trust exists or not. My amendment will provide that this shall be determined by the courts, the same as any other question of fact. It will empower the importer of any article to apply to the courts for exemption from duty for the reason that the article is controlled by a trust, and allow the courts to take evidence and determine the question. Such a plan would make all the importers detectives and interested in enforcing the law."

To such an amendment no one who believes in protection should object. Yet, to this amendment that all protectionists should welcome there is objection. It is spoken of as "embarrassing," but why should it embarrass anyone? Obviously it can embarrass none save those who would make the tariff a protector of monopoly and special interests and who fear to become the outspoken advocates of a monopoly tariff. That there should be opposition to this amendment does not speak well for some of the advocates of protection. It shows that they want a tariff built so as to conserve special interests, not the general weal.

That all the Republicans in the Senate will avow themselves, when it comes to the scratch, as advocates of a monopoly tariff



we cannot believe, and we trust the amendment will receive favorable consideration at the hands of the Senate and be agreed to by the House.

WHILE waiting for the House to pass the tariff bill, the Senate has time on its hands to kill. The President is slow in sending in appointments, and so the Senate has not much to do in the way of confirmations. The Anglo-American Arbitration Treaty is again being disturbed from its slumbers, and the Committee on Foreign Relations promises to bring it before the Senate again, not in its original form, but loaded down with amendments that well nigh nullify it. Thus the name of King Oscar is to be eliminated from the document and no means of selecting the odd arbiter provided for, and the right is reserved to the Senate to say what questions shall be and shall not be submitted to arbitration. The proper thing to do with this treaty that, if ratified in its original form would have bound us to submit questions in dispute to a court prejudiced in Great Britain's favor, handed over our destinies in certain matters to the arbitrament of a monarch who owes a debt of gratitude to Britain, is to kill it outright, and put our stamp of disapproval upon it, not to hack it to pieces and permit it to draw out a lingering life.

In connection with this treaty, one significant thing has come to pass. A meeting to urge ratification was called in New York, presided over by Seth Low, addressed by several eminent divines and by Samuel Gompers, who, among other things said: "We have seen, as we see now, numbers of men advocating a great increase in the army of our country. Ah, my friends," he continued, "that in itself is a declaration that government by and for the people is not the success that we would have it." But is this an argument for ratifying the Anglo-American arbitration treaty? Quite the reverse. Who are the men advocating an increase of our army? Are they the men opposed to entering into a one-sided arbitration treaty with Britain? No. They are the men who urge its ratification, who are bent on enslaving our people to the power. And for what do they want an army? To cow into submission those they would enslave, nothing else; and what do they want a treaty of arbitrament with Great Britain for, save it be to get Britain's *quasi* assistance to this end. The treaty of arbitrament is a treaty that would work for oppression, not for peace.

This meeting above referred to ran along drearily until a Tammany brave and civil magistrate, not down on the list of speakers, took the floor. "I care not for the depreciation of securities. I care more for the depreciation of American patriotism," he shouted. He caught the ear of the audience, and carried the better part of the meeting with him. And the result was the ratification meeting turned into a meeting urging the Senate to reject the treaty. So when Mr. Low put the resolutions urging the Senate to ratify the treaty, a thunderous No came back from the meeting. The majority was evidently against the resolutions. But Mr. Low declared them carried, and so the meeting adjourned.

SPAIN, bankrupt, stript of her sons, beset with rebellion in two widely separated quarters of the globe, and threatened with revolution at home, is in a sorry plight. The rebellion in the Philippine Islands has grown beyond control, Manila, the capital, is threatened by the rebels, and the Archbishop sends to Madrid a despairing appeal for more troops. Well he may, for the rebellion is directed against the hierarchy of the Church, and if he should fall into the hands of his enemies it would go hard with him. A death by torture would be his lot, for the rebels, brave men as they have shown themselves to be, are thoroughly incensed and show no compassion. But the archbishop demands that which the Madrid Government has not to give. New troops

Spain has not the means to raise and equip, and so the alternative looms before the Spanish of voluntarily giving up Cuba, and sending the troops now in Cuba to the Philippine Islands, or losing her possessions in both East and West Indies.

The alternative is a hard one for a proud race, but it is pressing. We would do a service to both Spain and Cuba if we pointed out the path.

WHAT counts for more than all their militant braggadocio in this European scrimmage is the grand and dismal consciousness in the palpitating bosoms of the Powers that all and each of them are desperately hard-up. If they had a few dollars to spare for a real good time we should have long ago been given a free show of fireworks on an international scale. Five cents worth of self-confidence would start a pretty display at this moment, but it halts for fear of blowing up the magazine. National debts are difficult sums to add up. That of France is too big to be disclosed even to its own people, perhaps \$200 per head, by far the heaviest ever incurred by any nation. The debts of Russia, Italy and Germany average about one hundred dollars per head of their populations. Turkey and Greece are bankrupt, their nominal national debts being about eighty dollars per head in each country, but, of course, with fewer resources than the former. Each of these strictly powerless Powers has been overspending its income for years on instruments of destruction instead of implements of construction, and they all crave for more weapons of murder and suicide. The sight of the due bills for these alone terrifies them into judicious cowardice.

THE French Chamber of Deputies, on Monday approved, by a vote of 356 to 143, the Government's decision to adhere to the concert of the Powers in their determination to preserve the peace of Europe by their enforced pacification of Greece. It was characteristic of certain of our irresponsible press correspondents in Europe to suggest in their Sunday dispatches that if France took this, the only course consistent with the best national interest, it would be because the Chamber of Deputies had their pockets filled with bribes. A significant compliment from one virtuous republic to another. Foreign Minister Hanotaux need not have added anything to his cogent remark that "the Cretan imbroglio can certainly be arranged without us, but it can also be arranged against us." France has everything to gain by prudence, and everything to lose by short-sighted rashness.

By next winter it is more than possible that great things will be doing in Africa. Predictions are foolish flourishes of omniscience at any time, none the less so if chance brings them true, and yet the drift of slow moving lava forecasts its destiny all the more surely for its very sluggishness, unhindered by the superficial splatterings which the newspapers delight in as "dramatic." Where natural law gains its end by usually noiseless persistence, the processes of international adjustment, being the work of exceedingly human creatures, are jerky, often ridiculous, and usually blundering. So there will probably be much stutting of plumed warriors, to the martial whooping of patriot orators groping in the gloaming of parliamentary caves, and much stricking of the Gallic cockatoo and Teutonic broiling eagles, to the roaring bass of the little lion and big bull, with a world-gallery full of braying jackasses for chorus. Then may the curtain rise on a transformation scene for the Twentieth century play, with France and England fraternally settled in the north, the Transvaal and Orange Free State basking peacefully in the bosom of the British Empire, Germany busy repairing its cracked foundations, Turkey and Greece sweetly sleeping under the influence of a powerful narcotic.

## THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

THE President's Message reads like a chapter from a Republican campaign book. He contrasts the surplus in revenues shown during the last two years of Mr. Harrison's administration with the deficits of Mr. Cleveland's regime, he tells us how between March 1, 1889, and June 30, 1892, our public debt was reduced by \$259,076,890, and how since March 1, 1893, our interest-bearing public debt has been increased by \$262,315,400. Thus he contrasts Republican and Democratic rule, leaving us to infer that it was because the reins of Government were taken out of Republican and put in Democratic hands that a deficit in revenues took the place of a surplus, and new bond issues the place of the payment of old. He does not tell us that it was pursuit of the monetary policy that he has taken from the hands of Mr. Cleveland, and that was handed down by Mr. Harrison to Mr. Cleveland, that led to the bond issues of the last administration. He does not tell us that Mr. Harrison and Mr. Foster had made full preparations for a bond issue; that the plates from which to print the bonds had been engraved, and that the only thing that induced Mr. Harrison to postpone the making of an immediate bond issue, for which he had prepared was the fact that his administration was drawing to a timely close, and his desire to shoulder the responsibility and the onus of such issue on the incoming administration.

It short, Mr. Harrison inaugurated the policy that has led up to the increase of our public debt, but he managed to shunt off the blame on Mr. Cleveland. Yet, the blame, though it should have been shared by Mr. Harrison, did not fall on underserving shoulders, for Mr. Cleveland planted himself firmly on the ground taken by Mr. Harrison and relentlessly pursued the policy to which must be attributed the export of gold and the drain on the Treasury gold reserve which has been made the excuse for the bond issues of the last four years.

And now comes Mr. McKinley planting himself firmly in the footsteps of Mr. Cleveland and bent on pursuing the course indicated by those footsteps, a course that can but lead to the resumption of gold exports, an ever-recurring drain on the Treasury gold reserve and the building up of this reserve by piling bond issue on top of bond issue. But it is not to pursuit of a false monetary policy that Mr. McKinley attributes the bond issues of Mr. Cleveland's administration. He attributes them to pursuit of a false tariff policy and the deficits in revenues. He recognizes, of course, that the bond issues were made to replenish the gold reserve held for the redemption of greenbacks, but he assures us that if there had been no deficit in revenues this reserve would not have been depleted and there would have been no occasion to replenish it, that it was because the gold reserve was drawn on to meet the daily deficits in revenues that it was depleted and bond issues made necessary.

But the President's assertion is not borne out by facts. As a partisan statement made in the heat of the campaign, we might excuse it; in an official document such a statement is sadly out of place.

The direct cause of the depletion of the gold reserve that preceded each one of the bond issues was, in every case, the presentation of greenbacks and Treasury notes for redemption in gold. Gold coin was not paid out of the Treasury vaults to meet the deficits in revenue, and such deficits cannot, therefore, be held as the direct cause of the depletion of the gold reserve. Whether or not they were the indirect cause, we shall see in a moment, but the direct cause was undeniably the presentation of greenbacks and Treasury notes for redemption in gold. In other words, it was the demand for gold by men who had greenbacks and Treasury notes to give in exchange for gold that made the drain on the gold reserve. These men paid greenbacks and Treasury notes into the Treasury, and gold was paid out to them in return. Thus was the gold reserve in the Treasury pulled down while

the reserve of greenbacks and Treasury notes was built up, and it was the reserve of greenbacks and Treasury notes thus accumulated that made the fund out of which the deficits in revenues were made good. So, it is said, and quite correctly, that the bond issues made to replenish the gold reserve did put in the Treasury the means of providing for the deficits in revenues.

But because greenbacks and Treasury notes redeemed with borrowed gold have been used to cover the deficits in revenues, we must not jump to the conclusion that the gold was borrowed for this purpose, nor must we conclude that if it had not been for such deficits there would have been no bond issues. Gold has been borrowed to make good a gold reserve depleted by the presentation of greenbacks and Treasury notes for redemption. This is the unquestioned fact. The only question is, then, what led to the presentation of these notes for redemption? Was it a deficit in revenues? Assuredly it was not. It could not have been. It was the export of gold that led to the presentation of these notes for redemption. This cannot be gainsaid.

But why could it not have been a deficit in revenues that led to the presentation of greenbacks for redemption? Let us see, and, first, who has made the demand on the Government for gold, presenting greenbacks and Treasury notes in exchange. Obviously it must have been made by men who preferred gold to greenbacks, and who had greenbacks to give. And were these men the pensioners, the employees of the Government? No; these men have not asked the Government to pay them in gold; they have been paid in greenbacks, and they have evinced no desire to exchange these greenbacks for gold. They have had no preference for gold, for gold would have been no more serviceable to them than greenbacks. So they have not presented the greenbacks paid them for redemption in gold. Greenbacks have been just as good to them as gold, have had just as great a purchasing power and debt-paying power as gold, and so these creditors of the Government have spent their greenbacks, making no effort to convert them into gold.

But for one purpose, and to some men, greenbacks are not just as good as gold. And what is this purpose and who are these men? The purpose is the payment of our foreign indebtedness; the men, those who make it their business to settle this indebtedness; in other words, the foreign exchange bankers. And these are the men who, preferring gold to greenbacks, have presented greenbacks for redemption in gold, caused the depletions of the gold reserve and paved the way for bond issues to replenish it.

And why have these men preferred gold to greenbacks? Can their preference be laid at the door of the deficits in revenue? Not at all. They have preferred gold to greenbacks only because it was worth more, or they hoped it would be worth more to them than greenbacks. And gold has been worth more to them than greenbacks for two reasons: first, because they wanted gold for export; second, because they wanted gold with which to subscribe for new issues of bonds which they counted on being made to replenish the gold reserve that they had depleted. For neither of these purposes were greenbacks available. Hence, the demand for gold by these men.

The second reason for the presentation of greenbacks for redemption in gold grew in intensity with the approach of each bond issue, as might have been expected; the first whenever the demands of our foreign creditors for payment happened to be most pressing. But here it must be added that the second reason for the demand for gold grew out of the first, for if there had not been a demand for export to cause the gold reserve to run down, there would have been no prospect of bond issues and hence no inducement for men to exchange greenbacks for gold in anticipation of using such gold in the purchase of new issues of bonds.

So it is to gold exports that we have to attribute the bond issues of the last four years. And what part have deficits in



revenues played in these exports of gold? Obviously, no direct part at all. Gold has been exported simply because our foreign creditors have demanded payment of their indebtedness, or rather the interest charges accruing upon it, and we have found it impossible to export produce in a volume sufficient to place to our credit abroad a fund large enough to meet these demands. So we have had to send gold.

And this brings us back to the question, why is it that our foreign creditors have demanded payment and refused to reinvest the interest moneys due them in our securities? The answer is very simple. We have not been prosperous, and they have not cared to invest in enterprises that were not prosperous. So they asked for payment, and payment in merchandise we have been unable to make, for the prices realized for our exports have been so low that, though we have increased the bulk of our exports greatly, we have succeeded in increasing their debt-paying power very little. And it is in this very fact that we find the reason for the want of prosperity that has caused our foreign creditors to hesitate to loan us moneys due them and which we found it inconvenient to pay. They would take gold or they would have the indebtedness we could not pay secured by a blanket mortgage on all the property of the country. And this blanket mortgage, not being forthcoming, they took gold until the Treasury gold reserve ran down and threatened to vanish. Then the Government executed a blanket mortgage by issuing \$50,000,000 of bonds which it sold to replenish the reserve, offering them to our own exchange bankers and their allies and through them to our foreign creditors. But this issue was but a drop in the bucket. The relief was but temporary. A second bond issue of \$50,000,000 was made, and then a third of \$62,315,400. But the fund that our exchange bankers put to their credit in London, by placing a large part of this issue abroad, was soon exhausted, and then we had a fourth bond issue of \$100,000,000.

Such is the true history of our bond issues. It is a history not of deficits, but of a foreign indebtedness, the interest charges on which, owing to the depreciation in the debt-paying power of our exports, we have found it impossible to pay.

That which is responsible for the depreciation in the debt-paying power of our exports is, then, responsible for the bond issues. And what is this that is responsible? An enhancement in the value of money, nothing else. And for this enhancement who is responsible? Mr. Cleveland? Yes, but not one whit more so than Mr. Harrison and Mr. Foster.

We have had since the drain for gold for export threatened the stability of our gold reserve a change in tariff policy. But at the inception of this threatening drain on our gold reserve we had a change in monetary policy much more serious. That change was made by Mr. Foster, in October, 1891, when he directed that the holders of Treasury notes, presenting them for redemption, should be paid in either gold or silver as they preferred. They preferred, of course, the dearer metal, and the result was that the demand for gold was enhanced, and the demand for silver diminished. The inevitable result was that gold became dearer, as measured by commodities, and more sought after than ever, and the more it was sought after the dearer it became, and the more insistent became the demands for redemptions. And so it was that Mr. Harrison and Mr. Foster stimulated the presentation of Treasury notes for redemption, and paved the way to a drain on the Treasury gold reserve and bond issues.

If Mr. Foster had pursued the course of redeeming the Treasury notes in that coin which the Treasury could have most conveniently supplied, there would have been none of this stimulating of the demand for gold which has been so costly to the Government and our people, for then the tendency would have been to hold our gold and silver coin together, not to drive them apart, and then it would not have been necessary to resort to the costly, artificial and temporary expedient of keeping our Treasury

notes at par with gold, by borrowing and providing for their redemption in gold.

The only natural way to hold our gold and silver coin together is to increase the demand for that coin which shows a tendency of falling below par, and decrease the demand for that coin which shows a tendency of rising. In this way gold coin and silver coin could be kept together without effort, but when we give to the noteholder the privilege of demanding payment in either metal, the noteholder will demand payment in the dearer, and become more insistent on payment in the dearer just as the divergence in the current value of the two coins becomes greater. And so long as we pursue this policy we can only keep our different kinds of money at par by providing for redemptions in gold, and providing this gold by bond issues. Yet this is the policy inaugurated by Mr. Harrison, followed by Mr. Cleveland, and now pursued by Mr. McKinley. It is folly to strive to maintain the parity between gold and silver coin by increasing the demand for gold when it evinces a tendency to go to a premium, and decreasing the demand for silver coin when it evinces a tendency to fall. We must reverse this, decreasing the demand for gold when it is at a premium, thus causing it to fall, and increasing the demand for silver coin when it is worth less than gold coin, thus causing it to rise. This is the only way that, in the long run, we can keep gold and silver coin on a parity, for we cannot keep up bond issues forever. This is a rule we must follow, whether we have free silver coinage or not.

We have arrived, then, at a place where we can place the responsibility of the bond issues of the last few years. It lies on all those who have insisted on pursuing the unwise course of giving to holders of our paper currency the option as to what kind of coin the notes they hold shall be redeemed in. It is this that has made the insistent demand for gold, precipitated the fall in prices, gold exports, depletion of the gold reserve, and bond issues. And Republicans are as responsible for this course as Mr. Cleveland. Mr. Harrison is as guilty as Mr. Cleveland, and Mr. McKinley is following in the footsteps of his two predecessors.

But now, having gotten at the true reason for the bond issues, let us examine the reason given by Mr. McKinley. His reason is deficit in revenues, his remedy, of course, a high tariff to provide more revenue. So he tells us of the accumulation of great deficits during the past few years, of how the deficiency for the three years and eight months ending March 1st summed up to no less than \$186,061,580. For the four years ending March 1st it was \$196,387,119.

Now, during the same years we borrowed \$293,454,285 and have at this time a cash balance of but \$217,000,000. From this it is clear that if we had not replenished the Treasury by borrowing there would not be a cent in the Treasury and the Government would have something like \$76,000,000 of unpaid claims against it besides. Clearly, then, if we had not borrowed to replenish the gold reserve, we would have had to borrow to meet the expenditures of the Government.

But it does not follow that if there had been no deficit in revenues, no occasion to borrow on this score, that there would not have been occasion to borrow on the score we did. And when we remember the score on which we did borrow, and what led up to the depletion of the Treasury gold reserve and the bond issues, we must admit that such causes were in large measure independent of the deficit and would have been present whether we had a deficit in revenues or not. Even Mr. McKinley is not entirely blind to this. "It may be urged" he says, "that, even if the revenues of the Government had been sufficient to meet all ordinary expenses during the past three years, the gold reserve would still have been insufficient to meet the demands upon it, and that bonds would necessarily have been issued for its repletion." But, "be this as it may," he adds, "it is clearly manifest, without denying or affirming the correctness of such a

conclusion, that the debt would have been decreased in at least the amount of the deficiency." It is, indeed, quite true if there had been no deficit in revenues, the money borrowed must have remained piled up in the Treasury and would be an offset against the debt incurred, but it does not follow that the bonded debt would have been increased by any less amount than it has been.

If there had been no deficit in revenues the gold reserve would have been depleted in much the manner that it has been and bond issues would have been made to replenish it. And then how would we have stood to-day? Instead of having paid out, to meet a deficit in revenue, \$196,000,000 of the \$293,454,285 realized from the bond sales, the whole amount of the borrowed money would have remained in the Treasury, and instead of a cash balance of \$217,000,000 we would have piled up in the Treasury something like \$400,000,000. Thus we would have had our currency contracted by the bond issues to the full amount of the money borrowed. As it is, we have had it contracted only by the difference between the sums realized from bond sales and the deficit in revenues, plus payments made on account of Pacific Railroad indebtedness, or by about \$90,000,000.

And what would we have gained by contracting our currency by \$293,000,000? Have we gained anything by the contraction of \$90,000,000? We would have gained a fall in prices much more severe than we have gained; but would this have been to our profit? It would have been greatly to the loss of our producing classes, our farmers, manufacturers, miners, wage-earners. But it is said we would have gained something before we had contracted our currency to the full limit of the bond issues that we have made, gained something that would have obviated the need of the last bond issue. In short, it is held that the fall in prices would have stimulated exports and discouraged imports to a degree that would have led to the building-up of a favorable trade balance sufficient to meet the claims of our foreign creditors and thus obviated the necessity of gold exports. But would it? We must answer, no; for to build-up the debt-paying power of exports in the face of falling prices is an unending task. Cutting prices in the hope of stimulating exports so as to increase the debt-paying power, is most likely to bleed one to death, for the fall in prices is prone to neutralize the increase in volume, the result being impoverishment of a people without coming one step nearer to the payment of the indebtedness.

So we may conclude that the piling up of money in our Treasury, as it would have been piled up if there had been no deficit in revenues, would have profited us nothing. A people would have been bankrupted, but the demands of our foreign creditors for gold would have been as insistent as they have been, and the bond issues just as large, if not larger.

It is needless to go into the whys and wherefores of the present cessation in the drain on our gold reserve. Temporarily we have profited from the misfortunes of our competitors. We cannot count on misfortunes overtaking them year in and year out, and when nature smiles again, as is her wont, on the efforts of the Indian and Argentinian, then again will we find prices and the market for our products fall away; then again failing to meet the demands of our foreign creditors with exports of merchandise, will come a demand for gold, and a drain on our Treasury for gold and a depleted reserve will return to plague us. And for this Mr. McKinley provides no remedy, for an increase in revenues is not a preventive for gold exports, a depletion of the reserve or bond issues to replenish it. This Mr. McKinley will find to his chagrin.

It is not more revenue that we need. With a cash balance in the Treasury of \$117,000,000 over and above the gold reserve, there is no present need of more revenue. What we need and must have to save us from bankruptcy are higher prices for our products, for higher prices, and higher prices alone, can put us in position to pay the demands of our foreign creditors.

#### THE DINGLEY TARIFF AND THE FARMER.

THE plaint of Mr. McKinley's message to Congress is more revenue, not more protection. He asks for protection only incidentally to an increase of revenues, asks not for changes in tariff duties solely with a view to extend protection, asks only that when the schedules are changed with a view to raising revenue they be changed so as to extend what incidental protection can be extended without interfering with revenues. In brief, Mr. McKinley does not show himself as the apostle of high protection. He shows himself as the advocate of a tariff for revenue with incidental protection. He showed himself in the same light when he appointed Mr. Gage as his Secretary of the Treasury. His recommendations for a protective tariff he confines to one small paragraph, superficially broad enough to suit anyone, but narrow from their very broadness. Through the whole of the short message runs the same train of advice. It is that a tariff for revenue is the primary need—a tariff for protection is of secondary importance. This thought has taken possession of Mr. McKinley. It shows out in every line of his message. Everywhere he urges the need of tariff changes to produce more revenue. Nowhere does he urge changes in tariff for protection's sake. To provide the Treasury with revenues sufficient to meet the expenditures is his ever-pressing demand. The raising of duties with the primary purpose of extending protection he does not press at all.

Yet the Dingley Tariff bill aims at more than the mere raising of revenue with such incidental protection as may be extended, and the Dingley bill has, presumably, the approval of the President. So it seems the President is a little at sea over tariff policy, or it may be that he is purposely indefinite. Yet why should the President wish to be indefinite about the tariff? He should not be indefinite, no President should be indefinite about any great question of policy; but Mr. McKinley has a way of being indefinite about everything, and keeping himself in readiness to set his sails to any wind that blows. And so it may be that he wishes to train in accord with his great money supporters of the last campaign, and get himself ready for a change of front that will make him available to lead the Republican party in 1900, which promises by that time to have become the party of low tariff, even as it has become the party of the gold standard. The party that has bowed before gold and suffered the dictation of its financial policy at the hands of aliens and those with alien interests may be expected to suffer the dictation of foreigners as to its industrial policy. It is only natural that it should, and it is only natural that time servers should change front with the party.

But, whatever the reason may be, Mr. McKinley recommends protection only incidentally to the raising of revenue. "In raising revenues," he says, "duties should be so levied upon foreign products as to preserve the home market, so far as possible, to our own producers." This is all he recommends in the way of protection: the levying of duties primarily with a view to raising revenue, but in such a way as to preserve the home market so far as that may be possible without materially interfering with the raising of revenues. He hopes that duties can, after this manner, be levied in such a way as "to revive and increase manufactures, to relieve and encourage agriculture, to increase our domestic and foreign commerce, to aid and develop mining and building, and to render to labor in every field of useful occupation the liberal wages and adequate rewards to which skill and industry are justly entitled."

All these ends are to be devoutly wished for. The tariff that will thus revivify trade and industry will be hailed everywhere with joy. But no tariff can bring these ends, much less a tariff that is framed for revenue, not protection. To revive and increase manufactures is well, but manufactures cannot revive, much less increase, until a demand can be found for manufactured



products sufficient to absorb the output of the old mills, let alone new.

Now, society is divided into two great classes, the manufacturing and agricultural, each engaged in supplying the wants of the other. Clearly, then, the manufacturing class cannot prosper unless the agricultural class can buy the products of the mills. It may be said, start up the mills, a market will be made for agricultural goods, and at remunerative prices, and then the farmer can turn around and buy manufactured goods, thus making a market for the products of mill and factory. But our farmers must, unfortunately, look beyond our shores for a market for a great part of their produce, and before they can prosper, this market must be made better, and ready to absorb at better prices the products of our farms. And no tariff can make this market better, no tariff can relieve our farmers of the competition they meet in this market.

Our farmers can only be relieved of the severity of that competition by destroying that which has engendered it. And what has engendered it? The discarding of silver by the nations of the Western world, and the resulting depreciation of silver as measured by gold, but not as measured by commodities, or the cost of production in silver and paper-using countries, which has put it in the power of the peoples of these latter countries to sell their products to gold-using peoples for less and less gold, just as gold has risen as measured by silver. So it is that our competitors have enjoyed a practical bounty equivalent to the premium on gold as measured by silver; it is this bounty that has engendered the ruinous competition from which we suffer, and it is this bounty we must destroy in order to relieve our farmers of unfair and crushing competition. And there is only one way to destroy this bounty, and that is to restore bimetallism, re-establishing the old parity between the two metals, and causing the premium on gold, as measured by silver, to disappear.

So a tariff can do little or nothing to relieve and encourage agriculture, for it cannot relieve our farmers from the severe and unnatural competition encountered in the European markets with those enjoying a bounty on their exports in the shape of a premium on gold. Yet the framers of the Dingley tariff have gone through the farce of promising the agricultural classes protection and relief. "They have put back the full McKinley rates, in most cases, on agricultural products, because they have felt that the farmer was entitled to all that it was possible to do for him by protective duties." This is what we are told, yet the very little that it would be possible to do for our agricultural classes by protective duties has not been well done.

There are few agricultural products of which we are not large exporters, and tariff duties cannot protect those who produce for foreign markets. But to the general rule there are two notable exceptions. We are large importers of wool and flaxes and other textile grasses, and to the producers of these raw textiles we could extend directly the benefits of protection. We could protect them from foreign competition. But what does the Dingley bill do for these producers? It gives them the shadow of protection rather than the body.

Thus are the wool-growers treated. Ample protective duties are placed on wools classified as clothing and combing wools, and then the good work spoiled by leaving open a path by which these duties can be evaded. On clothing and combing wools duties of 11 and 12 cents a pound are placed, but on carpet wools valued at less than 13 cents a pound a duty of but 32 per cent. *ad valorem*. And as the wools entered as carpet wools come at an average valuation of less than 10 cents a pound, it can be seen that the rate of duty on these wools would be little if any more than 3 cents a pound. This duty is, Mr. Dingley tells us, levied for revenue, not protective purposes, that the duties on clothing and combing wools are alone designed to be protective. But our experience under the McKinley tariff was that manufacturers found a way to enter clothing and combing wools as carpet wools,

and thus was defeated, in large measure, the protection that it was intended should be extended to the producers of clothing and combing wools. And so it is that the wool-growers have little faith in the Dingley bill, for the wool schedule is based on the McKinley bill. The rates of duty are the same, and there has been but little change made in the classification of wools. The wool-growers fear, and with reason, that 12-cent duties mean 3-cent duties.

But, after all, as compared with the great agricultural interests, the wool-growing interest is very small. The total yearly value of our agricultural products falls but little, if any, short of \$2,000,000,000; the value of our wool clip is but \$30,000,000. In other words, the value of the wool clip is not more than 1½ per cent. of the total value of our agricultural products, it is not more than one-tenth of the importance of our cotton or wheat crops, and about one-sixteenth of the importance of our corn crop. So it is seen that even if the rates proposed in the Dingley Bill were protective of the wool interests, which they are not, the bill would be holding out but comparatively little direct protection to the agriculturists as a class. The farmer must get his advantage from protection out of the building up of a home market or not at all. And this distant advantage is not much to hold out to the farmer when we are forcing him to sell 30 per cent. of his products in the European markets in competition with competitors enjoying a bounty of 100 per cent., and when the price fixed in the European markets fixes the home price as well.

In the face of the fact that we find a market for two-thirds of our cotton, one-third of our wheat, thirty per cent. of the grand total of our agricultural products abroad; it is idle for the Ways and Means Committee of the House to give it out that they restored the McKinley rates of duties on the greater part of agricultural products because they felt that the farmer was entitled to all that it is possible to do for him by protective duties. Not the McKinley tariff duties nor any tariff duties can protect him from foreign competition because he meets this competition not in our markets but in the markets of Europe. It sounds well to fix the rate of duty on imports of wheat at 25 cents a bushel, but what material benefit can such duty confer on our farmers when there were imported last year, into the United States, only 1,472,814 bushels of wheat all told, while we exported 83,755,829 bushels. And how far is a duty on cotton going to benefit the planter when we export sixty pounds of cotton where we import one? It will benefit the raisers of Sea Island cotton, into competition with which the Egyptian cotton comes, it will benefit the great majority of planters not at all. And so it is through the whole line of our great staple agricultural products. We put duties on importations of cattle, and sheep, and horses; on importations of meats and dairy products; on importations of breadstuffs; but such duties give our farmers no protection against the severity of competition save it be along the Canadian frontier.

Last year we imported animals to the value of \$2,735,004, breadstuffs to the value of \$2,436,560, provisions—meats and dairy products—to the value of \$2,110,702, and cotton to the value of \$5,637,893, or a total of \$12,920,159. And it is against these imports, infinitesimal as compared to our exports, that we aim protective duties. If the duties were made absolutely prohibitive, our farmers and planters would feel no appreciable broadening in the market for their goods, and prohibitive they will not be made, for much of that which we import will come in, duty or no duty. Thus Egyptian cotton will come, for it is of superior staple and fitted for some uses to which our own cotton cannot be used to advantage.

The protection our farmers and planters want is in the European markets. It is in these markets they suffer from competition. Compare our exports of agricultural produce with the

diminutive volume of imports, and it will be seen what folly it is to talk of protecting our farmers and planters from competition by tariff duties. They do not feel foreign competition at home, it is in the markets of Europe that they feel it. We have seen that last year we imported animals, breadstuffs, provisions and cotton to the total value of \$12,920,159. Now, look at the volume of exports. We exported animals to the value of \$43,019,253, breadstuffs to the value of \$182,814,370; provisions, including hog and beef products, mutton and dairy products, to the value of \$134,599,500, and cotton to the value of \$233,412,777, a grand total of \$593,845,900. It is in the disposal of this great value of agricultural products that we meet severe foreign competition. The foreign competition our farmers and planters meet in our own markets amounts to nothing.

Only that which will relieve the competition our agriculturists have to meet in the foreign markets of its severity can then materially ameliorate the condition of our farmers and planters; and until the condition of our farmers is bettered, until they are able to buy more freely of manufactured goods, there is no show for manufacturing revival. Manufacturers, as well as farmers and planters, must wait, therefore, for that thing which will strip this agricultural competition in the European markets of a measure of its severity. And that thing is bimetallism. The re-establishment of bimetallism can alone take from our competitors the bounty they now enjoy, and the destroying of this bounty built up by a false monetary policy must be the precursor of prosperity.

Nothing else can open the way to prosperity, and no tariff, unless it carries with it an amendment opening our mints to free silver coinage, can bring prosperity to either farmers or manufacturers.

#### THE DINGLEY TARIFF AND THE MANUFACTURER.

THAT the Dingley tariff is framed so as to increase the revenues can not be questioned, but that it would come up to the expectations of its framer, should it be enacted into law, can well be doubted. An increase of sugar duties and the transferring of wool from the free to the dutiable list, cannot fail to materially increase the revenues. Mr. Dingley calculates an increase of \$20,000,000 and \$11,000,000 from these sources, respectively; he calculates that the suggested changes in the schedule of woollen manufactures would give an increase of at least \$14,000,000, and the changes in the other schedules of something over \$30,000,000, or an increase in revenue all told of somewhere between \$70,000,000 and \$80,000,000.

Such an increase would more than make good the deficit in revenues and leave a fair surplus besides, thus making it easy in connection with bond issues to force a contraction of our currency through the locking up of money in the Treasury vaults. With a surplus in revenues the full amount realized from any bond issue made to replenish the gold reserve could be kept locked up in the Treasury.

But the success of the proposed Dingley tariff, should it ever be enacted into law, as of any other tariff, as a revenue measure, must be largely dependent on general trade conditions. A tariff yielding ample revenue in a year of prosperity, commercial activity and free buying of foreign goods, will yield an insufficient revenue in a year of depression, stagnation and small imports. And it is just here that Mr. Dingley's estimates are likely to go awry, for he counts on trade revival and bases his estimates on importations at least as large as those of 1893. But, as a matter of fact, we have to deal, and we may expect to deal, with much smaller imports. The buying of foreign goods was not very free in 1893, but it is very much more restricted to-day than it was then. Indeed, for the calendar year just closed our imports fell short in value of our imports for the fiscal year 1893 by over \$160,000,000,—much of this fall due to a fall in prices to be sure,

but not all—and our imports give promise of going lower, not higher. And if our imports go lower, there will be less to collect duties upon, and of necessity smaller revenues.

So it is that Mr. Dingley, who counts on a gradual restoration of business activity, seems likely to have overshot the mark in judging of the results of his bill from a revenue standpoint. Our consumption of foreign goods is on the downward trend, and there is nothing in sight that gives promise of turning this trend. Only one thing can turn the trend, and that is something that will put our people on the path to prosperity. At present our farmers, our manufacturers, our wage-earners are headed in the opposite direction; they are spending, not adding to their accumulations; they are curtailing not extending their purchases, and of necessity there is a diminished demand for foreign products. The process of grinding down our producing classes to poverty is making itself felt in the volume of imports and on revenues, and until we overthrow this grinding process there is not the remotest prospect of any freer buying of foreign goods. And the prospect of overthrowing this grinding-down process is remote enough. Mr. McKinley, supporting the gold standard, is wedded to it; Mr. Dingley and the Republican majority in the House, standing for a dear dollar, are wedded to it. So we say, under conditions to be anticipated, the results of the Dingley bill as a revenue measure are much over-estimated.

The proposed tariff bill is, of itself, not calculated to better these conditions. It is calculated to benefit in a material manner no class of our people and no section of our country, much less the whole people and the whole country. It is framed as if the whole duty of the Government began and ended with keeping the National Treasury in smooth water. And this, too, seems to be Mr. McKinley's idea. It pervades his whole message. His one idea seems to be to provide the Treasury with revenue. To the conserving of the interests of our people he seemingly gives no thought. To protect the cash balance in the Treasury from depletion, a balance that is too large for the good of the country by at least \$75,000,000, Mr. McKinley bends all his efforts; to protect the interests of our producing classes and lighten their burdens, he bends no efforts at all. Such appears to be his notion of the duties of the Executive, and he, a President put in power by a party that has made its cardinal principle the protection and conserving of the interests of our people, the extending to them of governmental protection to aid them in their enterprises.

But though the President restricts his views of tariff legislation to the needs of the Treasury, and does not look beyond to the needs of the people, and though the proposed tariff, if placed on the statue-books, would not lead to manufacturing revival, or agricultural revival, or any other kind of revival, Mr. Dingley tells us that one of the purposes of the bill "is to encourage the industries of the United States." First and foremost it aims at stimulating manufacturing enterprise, but that its enactment would materially benefit manufacturers cannot be believed. What our manufacturers want is the restoration of the market for their goods that has been lost to them through the impoverishment of our farmers. And the building up of this market is not proposed. What the proposed tariff aims at is to preserve this market, curtailed as it is by agricultural impoverishment, to our own manufacturers; aims to protect our manufacturers in this market from foreign competition. But protection to our manufacturers in the enjoyment of this market cannot bring them prosperity. As we have before had occasion to remark, it is not loss of our markets to foreign manufacturers that weighs so heavily on our manufacturers. As a matter of fact, our markets have not been captured by foreigners; the trouble is that they have, to a great degree, been destroyed.

Mills and factories are idle, not because foreign mills are running in their place, not because our farmers and planters are buying foreign goods in place of goods of our own make, but because they are not buying as freely as has been their wont.



And they cannot buy freely until they get better prices for their products, and better prices they cannot get so long as we adhere to the gold standard.

That foreign manufacturers have not captured our markets, and that an increase of importations has not been the primary cause of manufacturing depression, is shown by the fact that importations of manufactured articles were less in value for the fiscal year 1896, and under the Wilson-Gorman tariff that let down the tariff barriers, than they were for the fiscal year 1891, under the McKinley tariff, the reported value for the latter year being \$256,690,839, and for the former \$239,655,309. That importations have increased in some lines, is quite true, but the great, the primary cause of manufacturing depression has been agricultural depression and the resulting curtailment in our home market. And so it is that the root of our trouble not lying in foreign competition, we cannot cure the trouble by repressing foreign imports.

But suppose we look at this subject of foreign competition and manufacturing depression a little closer. In 1891 we imported cotton manufactures to the value of \$29,712,624, in 1896 to the value of \$32,437,504—an increase of three millions. And can an increase in cotton importations to the value of three millions, an increase of but a fraction of one per cent. as compared to the value of the product of our cotton mills, be held accountable for the depression in cotton manufacturing, held accountable for the shutting down of one-third of our mills? Assuredly it cannot. Nor can the increase in woolen importations, an increase much more marked, be held accountable for the general shutting down of our woolen mills. In 1891 we imported woolens to the value of \$41,060,080, in 1896 to the value of \$53,494,400, an increase of twelve millions; but the loss in business to our woolen mills has been many times twelve millions. So it is clear that the primary cause of the shutting down of our woolen mills has been the impoverishment of the consumers of woolens, for the increase in importations of foreign woolens has not amounted to a tithe of the curtailment in the output of our own mills.

And if we look at silk importations we find that they were \$37,880,143 for 1891, and \$26,652,768 for 1896, a decrease of eleven millions, a decrease, it is fair to say, of value, but not in quantity of silks imported. It is to the importation of cheap Japanese silks, the import of which is encouraged by the premium on gold, added to the curtailment in demand, to the fact that our people have fewer dollars to spend for silks than they had in 1891, that the depression of the silk manufactures of Paterson is attributable.

Of iron and steel manufactures we imported \$53,544,372 worth in 1891, and \$25,338,103 in 1896, a decrease of twenty-eight millions consequent on the curtailment in the importations of tin plates. Of glass and glassware, we imported \$8,364,312 worth in 1891, and \$7,435,792 in 1896, a decrease of nearly a million, and of earthen, stone and china ware we imported \$8,381,388 worth in 1891, and \$10,605,861 in 1896, an increase of two millions.

All the foregoing makes it perfectly clear that were our imports of woolen, cotton goods, etc., repressed to the volume imported in 1891, under the McKinley Bill, the market for our manufactures would not be materially extended. The Dingley Bill, if enacted, might repress imports to a smaller volume than this, although the rates fixed in the new measure are, taken as a whole, lower than the McKinley rates, but the fact that is ever before us is that manufacturing depression is attributable to the impoverishment of our farmers and planters, and the fact that they have been obliged to restrict their purchases. To no other cause can the manufacturing depression be satisfactorily attributed. It cannot be attributed to the capture of our markets by foreigners, and it is therefore hopeless to look to a repression of importations for a remedy.

There is but one foundation stone on which can be built

manufacturing revival, and that is agricultural revival, and for agricultural depression there is but one remedy. And that remedy is bimetallism. It is the foundation on which to build up manufacturing as well as agricultural prosperity, and in the new tariff this foundation stone must be laid.

#### PROTECT THE MANUFACTURER—LET THE FARMER SHIFT FOR HIMSELF.

THE manufacturers are going to get along without the farmers. They are going to run the country without the farmers' votes, they are going to run their mills without a market for their goods. Politically and industrially the farmer is to be left out of account; he holds but a subordinate place in our economic scheme anyway. The manufacturer can and he will prosper whether the farmer does or not, he will hereafter look after his own immediate interests and let the farmer shift for himself. The manufacturers of this city, or at least a small knot of them, have their organ which speaks officially for the Manufacturers' Club, and this is what it says.

Some time since this organ had an editor who had an intuition of sound economic doctrine, who did not close his eyes to the fact that it is the agricultural community that makes the market for manufactured goods, who knew that anything that impoverished this community must sap the vitality of manufacturing industry, and who saw that the gold standard and the resulting premium on gold as measured by silver was weighing grievously on our farmers and planters. And so this organ consistently advocated protection and bimetallism, and for a time the sentiment of the manufacturers of Philadelphia trended in the same direction. But the time came when the manufacturers knuckled down to the money power, and this editor found himself out of accord with his surroundings. He set his sails to the wind that blew, but not quick enough to save his place. And then the *Manufacturer* found a new editor with no great depth of economic wisdom, who is imbued with the notion that the manufacturers are self-dependent, who seems to think that the manufacturers find among themselves and can find abroad a market for their goods, that the agricultural community, after all, makes but a market of secondary importance for manufactured goods, and who has set himself to prove that the manufacturers have no interest in promoting the welfare of the agricultural classes.

So taking this view, no less short-sighted than it is selfish, this editor, greatly incensed at what he styles the unreasonable demands of the wool-growers and others for protection, has taken to soundly abusing the whole agricultural class. The manufacturers have in their charity accorded the agriculturists much, but, he tells us, as these "agrarians" have shown little evidence of appreciation or thankfulness, they are no longer entitled to consideration at the hands of the manufacturers, and they shall have none.

In this vein our editor tells us of the "agrarian" movement in Germany. Having, through the working of reciprocity treaties, deprived her agricultural population of tariff protection and thrown the German markets open, in a measure, to the competition of the world in agricultural products, Germany "has gone forward at splendid strides, winning new markets in other countries and incidentally provoking the fearful wrath of the land-owners. These men," he continues, "finding that the products of their farms were coming into competition with imported agricultural products, began a campaign for silver money, excessive bounties, Government purchases of grain, revolution or anything." But suppose we paraphrase this. "Our manufacturers, finding that the products of their mills were coming into competition with imported manufactured products, began a campaign"—for what? What if not governmental protection, what if not a tariff wall to keep out these imports? And

is it laudable for manufacturers to ask for that which for farmers is a crime?

To put a duty of 140 per cent. on importations of woolen goods is all right; to put a duty on wool of half as much is "exorbitant," and the demand of Judge Lawrence that a specific duty of 8 cents a pound be placed on carpet wools, so as to give the wool-grower some safeguard against the importations of undervalued clothing wools, that, classified as carpet wools, came in under the McKinley law paying a nominal duty of but 32 per cent. on a fraudulently low value put upon them at port of export, is "particularly unreasonable."

The objection to this and other wool duties asked by the wool-growers is that the imposition of such duties would force the manufacturers to pay an exorbitant price for their wool, and "put them at such a disadvantage that they could not compete with foreign manufacturers in the cloth and carpet markets." But if the woolen manufacturers can compete with foreign manufacturers for the cloth and carpet markets of the world, why the need of more than differential duties on woolen goods? If unaided they can hold their own with the markets of the world, why can they not hold their own in the home market without protection? It would seem from this statement of the *Manufacturer* that our woolen manufacturers, having reached a point where, on an equal footing, they can compete with the world, have outgrown the need of protection. Surely, if this is so, the Wilson tariff, with its free wool, and duties of perhaps 50 per cent. on woollens, can have done them no injury, and we can measure a fair rate of duty for woollens under the tariff being framed by the duty placed on raw wools. A duty sufficient to make good the added cost of manufacturing consequent on the enhanced cost of the raw wool would surely suffice.

But the *Manufacturer*, special protector of manufacturers' interests, as it has chosen to become, is wrong, it is false to the interests of manufacturers. It is not doing that which will conserve the protective system; it is doing that which will pull it down. The truth is, it is not a foreign market after which our manufacturers are seeking. It is a home market, the market made by the agricultural community, that they want. Before they can prosper, this market must be broadened, and it is to the manufacturers' interests to conserve and build up this market. The manufacturer may loudly profess his self-dependence, but he cannot get along without this market. On a foreign market he cannot live, as his experience of the past few years should have taught him.

Having done with the wool-grower, our manufacturing editor, who is insistent that manufacturers should not go out of their way to promote, and have no interest in promoting agricultural prosperity, and who is going to see that manufacturers prosper whether farmers, or "agrarians," as he chooses to call them, do or not, takes a fling at David Lubin's proposal that the Government pay an export bounty on agricultural products. This payment of bounties is a very wrong way, and would prove a fruitless way to go about restoring agricultural prosperity, but it is hardly worth while to assail this proposition which is "setting the agrarian mind afire" as "nefarious business." But the temper of our manufacturing editor is aroused, and he winds up with a warning to the agrarian to "keep his eyes open and note that this country is on the verge of a new industrial era. It is," he continues, "headed in the direction of the foreign markets."

But if our country is, indeed, headed in the direction of the foreign markets, why should not our farmers be permitted to head in the direction of these markets as well as our manufacturers? Why should our agriculturists, who have products for sale that come into competition with the products of silver and paper-using countries, be handicapped? Let the American agriculturist be placed on the same footing, at least, with his competitor. To build up a bounty for the benefit of the silver and paper-using peoples is not fair. We cannot do less

for our agriculturists than put a stop to the payment of this bounty of 100 per cent. that our competitors now enjoy. This we can do by opening our mints to the free coinage of gold and silver, and restoring the parity between the two metals, when the bounty that has grown up with the divergence in the value of gold and silver will disappear.

This bounty has grown because the silver cost of production in silver and paper-using countries has not risen with the rise in gold, or, as we put it, the fall in silver. Consequently, as the premium in gold, as measured by silver, has risen, these peoples have been able to sell their products for less gold, for with less gold they have been able to buy as much silver, and with this silver pay for producing just as much produce as ever.

However we look at it, we must admit that our agricultural classes are entitled to be released from this handicap. They ask it not as a favor, but as a right; they beg no special favors at the hands of the manufacturers or any one else; they command that justice be done them, that they be accorded a fair show in competition with their competitors. And when this shall be accorded them, as we doubt not it will, they will pull themselves out of the rut of depression and make it possible for manufacturers to do the same. The prosperity of the despised "agrarian," his ability to buy of manufactured goods, is the force that must be waited for to turn the wheels of manufacture and commerce with that speed that can alone give assurance of profit, prosperity and happiness. For this, manufacturers must wait, and it is unwise for them to stand in the way of that which will bring agricultural prosperity.

#### WOMAN'S WAYS.

HERE'S to the men who lose!  
What though their work be e'er so nobly planned  
And watched with zealous care,  
No glorious halo crowns their efforts grand;  
Contempt is failures' share.

Here's to the men who lose!  
If triumph's easy smile our struggles greet,  
Courage is easy then;  
The king is he who, after fierce defeat,  
Can up and fight again.

Here's to the men who lose!  
The ready plaudits of a fawning world  
Ring sweet in victor's ears;  
The vanquished banners never are unfurled—  
For them there sound no cheers.

Here's to the men who lose!  
The touchstone of true worth is not success;  
There is a higher test—  
Though fate may darkly frown, onward to press,  
And bravely do one's best.

Here's to the men who lose!  
It is the vanquished's praises that I sing,  
And this is the toast I choose:  
"A hard-fought failure is a noble thing;  
Here's to the men who lose."

\*\*\*

Be careful where you step and those little ones that are following you will stumble less.

\*\*\*

Man is not meant to be a creature of one activity. The test of the nineteenth century was the enfranchisement of man and the exaltation of woman. The test of the twentieth century will be just the reverse—woman's enfranchisement and man's exaltation. There is no antagonism between the two. One river of blood, one battery of brain, unites the human race. Every woman is some man's daughter, and every man is some woman's son.—*Miss Frances Willard.*

\*\*\*

A woman's angelic disposition is never proved until she shows no sign of vexation when her husband brings home a guest unexpectedly to a dinner of left-overs.

\*\*\*

The story of the origin of "Home, Sweet Home," is short but pretty. The song was both written and composed by John Howard Payne, who first sang it in the far West by the grave of a noble red Indian, who, when all that made his forest wigwam "home" had gone, had died by his own hand on the grave of his loved squaw and papoose.



The people living round about the valley in which the grave was, sympathizing with the old Indian, buried him where he died, and Payne watched the ceremony in silence. At the finish, inspired by the scene he had witnessed, he sang quietly to himself the words and air of "Home, Sweet Home." He was overheard, and asked to write them down, which he did, with the result that they are familiar in every household in the civilized world to-day.

\*.\*

When at its zenith, the Roman Empire laid all the barbaric countries of the world under contribution to supply the tables of its nobles and wealthy citizens with the fine luxuries of life. Asia and Africa poured in the rich spices and fruits of the tropics; Germany and the great North countries raised the grains and wild berries; Italy and the fertile land of the Franks cultivated the vineyards to make or express the wines; every strip of sea coast from the Mediterranean to the Baltic contributed its quota of fish; and the forests of Brittany yielded the wild game of the woods—bird, beasts and fowls—for the banquets of the proud, dissolute rulers of the vast Empire. With the choice products of a great world so easily obtained, there were wanton waste, foolish extravagance and a strange disregard of the value of expensive luxuries, and the historian dwelling upon these times delights in recapitulating the various articles of diet arranged in tempting manner upon the groaning tables at the great feasts and banquets.

But, excepting Nero's dish of peacock tongues and Cleopatra's cup of wine with the dissolved pearls in it, the menu of our modern banquets would compare favorably with those spread in the times when gluttony, licentiousness and greed for luxury were insidiously sapping the strength of Rome.—George E. Walsh.

#### A WORD WITH THE DOCTOR.

NEVER keep food in the sick-room, and cover up water when it is necessary to keep it in the room for ever so short a time. Both absorb disease germs readily, and may reinfect the patient. A nurse should never eat in the sick-room.

\*.\*

Where it is desirable to see the tongue of a very small child the object may be accomplished by touching the upper lip with a bit of sweet oil, which will cause the child to produce its tongue.

\*.\*

In a case of fainting, place the patient on a couch or level surface, with the head not elevated; give free access to fresh air, loosen clothing, sprinkle the face with cold water, and, with utmost care, apply smelling salts or ammonia to the nostrils. Carelessness in the use of ammonia may cause serious injury to the delicate membranes of the nose.

\*.\*

When children are suffering from convulsions caused by constipation, indigestion or teething, give a hot bath with a tablespoonful of mustard in the water, or roll the child in a blanket wrung out of hot water—not so hot as to scald the tender skin—apply cold water to the head and administer every fifteen minutes a teaspoonful of syrup of ipecac; continue this until vomiting is produced.

\*.\*

In epileptic attacks, little can be done except to prevent the epileptic from injuring himself by falling or by biting his lips and tongue. The best resource for the latter purpose is to place a handkerchief between the teeth and make it serve as a gag. Take him into the fresh air. When the attack has passed away administer mild stimulants such as coffee or wine.

\*.\*

One of the small things to remember is, that alcohol will quickly remove an obstinate porous plaster whose period of usefulness has expired, and will also cause all unsightly traces of its use to disappear.

\*.\*

A doctor sent back a coat, that didn't fit him, to his tailor. A few days afterward they met at a funeral, when the tailor, pointing to the coffin, solemnly said: "Ah, doctor, you're a fortunate man; you never have any of your bad work returned on your hands!"

## THE EUROPEAN WAR CLOUD.

**Suspicious of One Another and in Awe of Public Opinion, the Powers Are Impotent.—Lacking in That Accord that Would Give Assurance of Peace, They Stumble Towards War.—Israel Alone Works Powerfully for Peace.—The Turks Arming and Counting on Playing the Powers Off One Against Another.—The Foibles of French Character and Parisian Gayety.**

(From Our Special Correspondent.)

WHAT next? This is the question that European "anxious inquirers" ask, with faint hopes—very faint—that somebody may vouchsafe a reply confirmative of the universal hope for peace. A week hence, we shall know, or ought to know, what may happen; at present everything is conjecture.

I cannot believe that there will be war; I cannot see how war can be avoided. My statement is paradoxical, and yet I can neither explain nor justify the omission of my paradox. Greece and Turkey were favored on Tuesday with an "identical" note from the "Powers," announcing their views, intentions and exigencies, all of which tend to the preservation of the *status quo*. Turkey will certainly accept the offered conditions; the Sublime Porte will agree to an arrangement which, relieving it of all responsibility, secures to it the payment of a tribute guaranteed by the European concert. But what may not happen if Greece refuses acquiescence? Beyond all doubt, the Osmanli will crush the Greeks like an egg-shell if it should come to a conflict, yet can Europe consent to the destruction of a Christian nation by the hordes of Islam? Is it conceivable that Greece would have ventured to act against all diplomatic usages if she were not insured against fire by the promises of a foreign protector in case of need—for a consideration? The violent explosion of *Phil-Hellenism* can only be accounted for on this supposition, and the question is necessarily narrowed down to one point: Who is the Grecian backer? Not Germany, nor yet Austria, nor Italy which counts for nothing, nor France which has nothing to gain, and thence the conclusion: either Russia or England has promised eventual support upon—I repeat—certain considerations that will become apparent later. I do not believe in the absolute unison of the so-called "European concert"; if absolutely agreed upon eventual joint coercive action, the note submitted to Greece and Turkey would have been one *collective* note, not an assemblage of *identical* notes. This point in itself is sufficient to prove that, spite of their agreement to preserve peace, the Powers do not agree on the question of the ways and means to arrive at that security.

#### How far Will Public Opinion Tolerate Coercion?

In certain European countries public opinion has still a certain influence with Governmental councils, and it is more than doubtful that the French will support any ministry which will take part with the oppressors against the oppressed; that the Russians will look on with equanimity at the massacre of their co-religionaries, or that the British people will endorse the action of a Cabinet pretending, in the interests of civilization, that those interests can only be saved by the destruction of a Christian nation.

#### Israel's Power and French Impotency.

In ordinary circumstances Israel would be a powerful factor of discord, Israel's aim being the eventual extinction of Christianity, by the upsetting of all Christendom; but, just now, as I have written, Israel holds *two milliards of Ottoman bonds*, and the destruction of the European Turkish Empire would be Israel's ruin, wherefore, I argue, that Israel will leave no stone unturned in efforts to avert the danger of a conflict of which no one can foresee the result, save in a general way: the French will again pay the piper by the forced cession of another portion of their territory; probably, Champagne, the rest of Lorraine, Nice and Savoy. I confess exaggerated sentiments of Franco-philism, but I cannot conceal my conviction that, given its present regime and the antagonisms of her political parties, France will be more terribly beaten in her next war with Germany than she was in 1870. France had an army then; now, she has simply a National Guard, from which the daily increasing efforts of demagogues have effaced, or are effacing, those elements of discipline without which her legions are becoming only an armed mob. The French Government is quite cognizant of this situation, and, for that reason will avoid every act which might compromise its relations with Russia, whence come its orders and instructions, and to which no observation is ventured, since

Count Monravier's visit here, and his affirmation that Russia's interests would always take precedence of all considerations of mere amity. So far, Russia was not inconvenienced by the British occupation of Egypt; should she so be, eventually, she would speak and act in accordance with circumstances, but not until then; Russia was bound to assist France, should France be aggressed, but if France should undertake a quarrel with England on a question where Russia was not interested, France must bear the consequences. The Count was categorical, M. Hanotaux was acquiescent, and the upshot of their interview was another "understanding," to the effect that the French Republic would act as bidden by the Autocrat of Russia. Look, then, to St. Petersburg for signs and tokens; France is merely a Zero, with or without value, according to its position after or before the Russian figure. France is no longer a planet, she is a mere satellite of the Russian Chancellory.

So far, the Tsar shows hostility to his uncle's projects; but circumstances may change that attitude, as, for instance, should England, suddenly, espouse the cause of Pan-Hellenism, and such an eventuality is not at all improbable.

#### Rivalries of the Powers, the Turk's Hope.

Meanwhile, Turkey continues to mobilize. Turkey is resigned to the loss of Crete, she will make no effort to retain that island, leaving to the Powers the onerous task of pacification and administrative organization, but as regards the reforms which Europe pretends to impose in general throughout his empire, the Sultan is infinitely less submissive. Abd-ul-Hamid will turn a deaf ear to the injunctions and threats of the Powers; he is arming, not to prevent the annexation of Crete by the Greeks, the which Europe undertakes to do, but to fight all Europe, or, at least, such European powers as may interpret literally the coercive threats which accompany the presentation of the reform programme.

The Sultan knows Europe, and fully appreciates the value of the pretended accord which could not resist the first shock of rival interests. He is convinced—and so are many other people—that a Russian movement in Armenia would provoke a British intervention, that if Austria marched on Salonica, Russia would mobilize instantly.

He trades on these rivalries to help him out of the ugly "fix" in which the Armenian massacres put him, and he proposes to bring those rivalries into action as soon as his legions are ready for the fray. And this is what is whispered not in the Chancelleries, but around the Chancelleries, behind the scenes of that diplomacy which quibbles over texts and disputes over the form of the note that ought to be presented to Greece and Turkey, a note that any law student could have drawn up in fifteen minutes.

#### Indifference and Foibles of the French.

You will then understand the existence of a feeling of grave uneasiness among the thinking elements of this Old World. I say the *thinking elements*, for among the masses, at least in France, there is naught but a sentiment of supreme indifference to all that takes place beyond the Gallic frontier. It is enough to have *Panem et Circensis* to content Parisians, and if they regret anything, it is that gladiatorial combats are merely, and to their mind insufficiently replaced by steeplechases, where death or mortal injury to some of the competitors is not a positive certainty, and are just consoled that the *Pari Mutual* and the book-maker may give them a chance of winning a little coin, never as a result in comparison with their risk of loss. Three days of the past week were consecrated to the *Bœuf Qua* parade, to which the City Fathers granted a subvention of 20,000 francs, and propose next year to allot 100,000 francs *cui bono*? Answer: To keep the mob from the consideration of anything serious. And the theatres? Here, too, I am at a loss to understand the whys and wherefores of journalistic *jeremiads* about the "theatre marasmus." The Government's official report for the year 1896 gives 30,000,000 francs as the receipts of the Parisian theatres, and, frankly, that sum does not indicate a decline of dramatic sympathy. Colonel Roquebrune, with Coquelin, at the Porte St. Martin, was and is a success; it is a glorification of Napoleon, and the nightly manifestations of its audience prove that, after all, the glories of the Empire still dominate among the French. Sardou's *Spiritisme*, even with Sara Bernhardt as chief inter-pretress and spite of the *reclame* of papal excommunication—entirely a fabrication—would not take, and has been replaced by *The Tosca*, *Madam Putiphar*, at the Athenee, and *The Newfoundland Dog*, at the Palais Royal, are intensely funny and remarkably well played; but neither they nor the *Demi Vierges*, at the Gymnase, nor yet the new piece at the Varietes, will bear analysis

or description to an American public. *Douleuruse*, at the Vaudeville, is a success, but rather owing to its most remarkable interpretation by Rejane, the first actress of the age in certain roles, not excepting Sara, than to the plot—by the way, how is it that Rejane failed to please in the United States? I do not like the piece; it is too psychological, and spite of its sprightly dialogue is too replete with slang to be taken as a fair exposition of the manners of that "great world" which Donnery pretends to describe, but to which he has never been admitted.

PARIS, March 5th.

Z.

#### PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED.

MEMOIRS OF MARSHAL OUDINOT, DUC DE REGGIO. Compiled from the hitherto unpublished souvenirs of the Duchesse de Reggio, by Gaston Stiegler, and translated by Alexander Teixeira de Mattos. pp. 474. New York: D. Appleton & Co. \$2.00.

THE STORY OF THE BIRDS. By James Newton Baskett. pp. 263, illustrated. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 65 cents.

A CHILD-WORLD. By James Whitcomb Riley. pp. 209. Indianapolis, Ind.: The Bowen-Merrill Co. \$1.25.

THE MIDDLE PERIOD, 1817-1858, with maps. (The American History series.) By John W. Burgess, Ph.D., LL.D. pp. 544. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$1.75.

HISTORY OF POLITICAL PARTIES, NATIONAL REMINISCENCES, AND THE TIPPECANOE MOVEMENT. By Col. Dorus M. Fox. pp. 541. Des Moines, Iowa: The Author.

#### Free Stop-over at Washington.

On all through tickets between the East, West, North and South, reading via Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, a stop-over at Washington can be secured, without extra charge for railroad fare, by depositing the ticket, upon arrival at Washington, with the B. & O. station ticket agent at that point. Washington is always attractive to visitors, and particularly so while Congress is in session. This arrangement for stop-over privilege will doubtless be appreciated by the public, and will bring to the National Capital many travelers to view its superb public buildings, monuments, museums and thoroughfares.—*Adv.*

#### WORDS OF WISDOM.

GIRLS, mark my words; and know, for men of sense,  
Your strongest charms are native innocence.  
Shun all deceiving arts; the heart that's gained  
By craft alone, can ne'er be long retained.  
Arts on the mind, like paint upon your face,  
Fright him that's worth your love from your embrace.  
In simple manners all the secret lies,  
Be kind and virtuous, you'll be blest and wise.

—Benjamin Franklin.

\*\*\*

You must plough with such oxen as you have.

\*\*\*

He is best served who has no occasion to put the hand of others at the end of his arm.—*Cervantes*.

\*\*\*

The man who can endure everything is either a saint or a cur.

\*\*\*

One-half of the men who have won wealth do not possess it; it possesseth them.

\*\*\*

The only true way to begin reform is to find the source of error.

\*\*\*

The good opinion of honest men, friends to freedom and well-wishers to mankind, is the only reputation a wise man would ever desire.—*Washington*.

\*\*\*

There are people who are always talking of doing great things; but because they wait for great opportunities, life passes, and the little deeds of love and kindness are not done at all.

\*\*\*

The great difference between the real statesman and the pretender is that the one sees into the future, while the other regards only the present; the one lives by the day and acts on expediency, the other acts on enduring principles and for immortality.—*Burke*.



## BOOK REVIEW.

ON THE FACE OF THE WATERS. A Tale of the (Indian) Mutiny. By Flora Annie Steel. New York: The Macmillan Co. \$1.50.

When the crown of popularity is bestowed on a book or a person, the first thing to be done by level-headed folk is to find what kind of readers or hearers decreed the coronation. It saves much wanton waste of wits and time to get at this before we get astray with the wrong crowd. Happy are they who postpone their personal acquaintance with all books with a boom until the boom has had at least one year's probation. If it continues as a subdued diapason roar after that test, it will pay to read, and, if not, not. But the line is not always to be drawn thus clearly. This new book by Mrs. Steel was sure of a welcome, because of the quality of her former novels. The fact of its running into eight editions in eight weeks is a very different sort of boom to those manufactured by the familiar puff paragraphist, as different as bullion and wind. The reviewers of England and America have joined in a grand chorus of praise over the long-coming novelist who, to their exalted imagination, has come at last. They roll the jubilant fugue, intent on bettering the topmost note of the one before, till the symphony ends in a monotone strain of triumph. So we have nothing else to do but echo the unanimous verdict which pronounces Mrs. Steel's novel "thrilling," "of intense dramatic power," "picturesque and powerful," "strong in its dramatic handling of heroic issues, and stronger still in its calm veracity."

Here we might stop, and doubtless might sleep o' nights the serene sleep of the virtuous jurymen. The testimony quoted is certainly true, and endorsable. But those who give it will not deny that it is not exactly the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. Every book has its limitations, which are not necessarily drawbacks, at least not so to all readers, but it is a drawback not to be informed what those limitations are, when the general impression created by wholesale praise is that there are none. The Indian mutiny of forty years ago is a bit of history perhaps even more vividly present to the British mind than is our war of the Rebellion to us. The intimate relations between the English people and the Hindoo race they rule; the element of horror in the massacre of children, women and men, their near kith and kin; the peril never yet absent from the task of at once overawing and conciliating a vast population of dark-skinned orientals, burning with ill-concealed hatred of the conqueror, these and other considerations give a living interest in Mutiny literature to the English reader and account for the enthusiasm of the English reviewers over a book like this.

Whether it is to be taken as a compliment to our amiability or a sarcasm on our Americanism, depends on the point of view, but it is decidedly unsatisfactory to the American book-reading public that so large a proportion of newspaper reviews should be little more than echoes of the puffs quoted from English papers in the paid advertisements of the publishers. Few English families are without ties that link them in some way with the victims or the actors in the Indian mutiny. To our people, India and its troubles are a far cry, though we give sympathetic hearing to its cries for our help in its periodic famines, such as that now spreading. Assuming a greater interest in, and a more intimate knowledge of, India, its history and social conditions, than exists among us generally, allowing full sway to the Kipling impetus, which after all is not a very important factor, it would be possible for a book to be written which should place the American people in possession of the same intense interest in the Indian mutiny as they have in everything relating to the Civil War. Mrs. Steel's is not such a book. It is wrong to make-believe that it is. If this were its aim, it has failed. Its "intense dramatic power" has the advantage of drawing upon fact for its fiction, but it minimizes history into melodrama. With perhaps exceptional interest in the mutiny due to early associations and much intercourse with men and women who went through it, we anticipated a rich enjoyment from these pages. On the contrary, the reading of Mrs. Steel's history-fiction, proved not only a teaser for one's wits and patience, but it leaves an impression as kaleidoscopic as its flavor is physicky.

This will just be what a large class of novel-readers want, and it is good to think we are helping them and the author to each other. A melodramatic book has spasms for chapters, stagey tableaux for scenes, blue-black demons for villains, angels for heroines and all the impossibilities for its every-day facts. The difference in this book is that the males and females are all

piebald, with the balance in favor of the dark brown. These strut the red-lit stage as veracious types of the English "upper class" in the India of 1857, who, it is interesting to learn, used to vary the slang of their daily conversation with Americanisms as modern as "hurry up." The morals of that remote year are depicted as up to date, or how could a woman's novel expect to reach eight editions in eight weeks? The famous names of those truly noble Christian heroes, Havelock and the Lawrences, are certainly mentioned once or twice. It is lamentably unavoidable in anything that pretends to picture the mutiny, but it would have utterly ruined the beauty of Mrs. Steel's harum-scarum social picture to have included their type. The gusto of her own liberal indulgence in slang for its own sweet sake, not to hint at her easy artistic touch in heightening the dabs of red and deepening the black spots in the talk of her piebald mis-lovers, will charm many who will skip the "history" patches. Such as this phase of life is, it is painted with undoubtedly artistic sympathetic insight. The history of these criss-cross couples is the muddy stream that runs through the Delhi scene of the mutiny. The author insists in her preface that every incident she describes "is scrupulously exact, even to the date, the hour, the scene, the very weather," and even the speeches of some of the actors. All have been worked up by the aid of scissors and stenographic notes dictated by persons who had been there. Compilation is very good in its way, especially when, as by Mrs. Steel, it is vivified by very graphic translation into colloquial speech by one so familiar with the place and native life. History is rather a large word for a snap-shot album, because it calls for a broader and loftier treatment than a book like this can rise to if even the conception had been there. The preface frankly proffers "a needed word of explanation," fearing that in "attempting to be at once a story and a history it probably fails" in one aim or the other. We suggest that it fails in both. Were it possible for a well-matured and balanced writer to make a satisfactory combination of these, which in that case would include worthier elements now omitted, that abler writer would have to make sure of his success by rigid avoidance of the spasmodic style affected by Mrs. Steel. If the reader gains any clear perspective of the scenes and events of the mutiny, he gains it in spite of and not because of the author's flashy way of making the showman's speech. It is possible to piece together into a connected picture the broken bits that now dazzle kaleidoscopically. On a third reading the book may very likely shape itself into a historical story, still blurred with incomplete characterization. Eight editions in eight weeks may or may not betoken a third reading by some, but they will probably be those who wish the up-to-date love story unspoiled by the mutiny pictures, or the pictures unspoiled by the romance. The far-fetched and rather silly title was the author's variation of the native explanation of the mutiny as a breath that came upon their people. It is a pity that "The Face of the Waters" did not wash the body of the story.

## BRIEFER NOTICES.

FRANCIS PARKMAN. A pamphlet. Boston: Little, Brown & Co.

Though undisguisedly a publisher's aid to business in form, this sixteen-page pamphlet is weightier and worth more than many a pretentious volume, because it helps the reader to the proper appreciation of undoubtedly the greatest historian our country has produced. We may be wrong, but the impression has strengthened itself during years of observation, in thinking that Francis Parkman is less known even among solid readers than many an author far inferior to him in well-sifted knowledge, sincerity, and charm of style. His "Montcalm and Wolfe" may be more widely read than we have supposed, and if so, there cannot be any question as to his hold upon the future. Parkman is one of those enviable writers who have disdained the arts of the trumpeter, well assured that time rectifies the false estimates created by unworthy motives and methods. His books have all the fascinations of "popular" books without condescending to superficial tricks which so easily make popularity. He was at once a thorough worker and an entertaining story-teller, but this sounds flimsy as praise of so serious a historian. It will serve for the easy class who need entertaining as they learn. Students and authors who have themselves labored in the same field, with no little success, unite in enthusiastic tributes to Parkman, the man, and the scholar. Now that he is dead, his larger fame will grow. He wrought heroically at his fifty years' task under the burden of physical disability. He must have had rare sweetness of soul, as indeed all who knew him testify, to impart so

# Wanamaker's.

## Clothing Made to Measure

THE best tailor shop in all Philadelphia is here. It is organized with the full corps of cutters and helpers from the fine old store at 818-820 Chestnut street added to the corps that has for years done the tailoring here.

Organization is ready.

The new fabrics are here. Suits at \$20 and \$60 and many prices between—suits made to perfection, with such elegance as you may choose. No slighting in the \$20 suits; no extravagance in the \$60 suits. The best of everything—that's all.

In fact, charges here are less than in any other tailor shops where fine work is done—simply because right business methods make less prices possible.

Trousers to order for \$5. Finest trousers that can be made from finest stuffs are \$12.

All ready.

Juniper and Market streets.

## Fur Storage

Don't be bothered. Don't take risks. We'll store your furs until fur time comes again. No risk—for you are insured against hurt to them by fire or moth. Not much to pay. Or, if the garments are to be made over, we charge nothing for the storage.

Second Floor, Chestnut street.

## JOHN WANAMAKER.

### Why You Should Have It.

## Bimetallism or

The Evils of Gold Monometallism and the Benefits of Bimetallism, \* \* \*

By WHARTON BARKER.

It discusses in every phase the most vital question of the day.

It is an exhaustive and conclusive work.

It is the clearest, fairest, most logical book ever written on bimetallism.

It presents facts and gives arguments based on proven facts to demonstrate why gold monometallism drives all producers to ruin and despair.

It shows why and how bimetallism will bring back general and lasting prosperity.

It is a book which will always have a distinct value of its own.

By all those best fitted to judge, it is admitted to be without an equal.

Only when you have read it can you appreciate why all this and much more is true. And you will find it to your advantage to do this at once, therefore send for a copy now.

Sent postpaid to any address on receipt of price.

Paper bound edition, - - \$ .50  
Library Edition, Cloth, - - 1.00

A limited number of slightly shop-worn copies—paper edition—are being sold at half price, 25 cents a copy. For all purposes as good as though fresh from the press.

BARKER PUBLISHING Co.,

119 South Fourth St.,

PHILADELPHIA.

Please mention The American.

exquisite a charm to the telling of dry information he had dug from the soil and from the world's out-of-the-way written records, and had drawn from intercourse with civilized and uncivilized people. He has arranged and focussed the stirring scenes of conflict when our world was newer than now with the unerring skill of an artist. Parkman was our great historian, in every essential respect. This pamphlet admirably introduces the man and his works to those less-well acquainted with them than they should be, and so will do good service.

\*.\*

THE INTERIOR DECORATION OF SCHOOLS. By Walter Gilman Page.

This is a rather esthetic pamphlet on an entirely esthetic theme, very sensible in its suggestions for making the school attractive to the eye and the mind of the children. The various wall-tints, from whitewash to the mottled rainbow hues, are discussed in relation to their good or bad effect on the optic nerve, the conclusion being that dead surfaces of any green or blue shades are the safest. There is room for a sermon in pamphlet form on the interior decoration of churches, but this is outside the present purpose. Nevertheless, the protest may as well be made here as anywhere else against the vulgar gaudiness which degrades many fashionable churches to the level of third-rate dance saloons. Surely, peace of mind is the first essential to a church-goer, and how can he get it when all the paint pots of the parish are flung into his eyes from every wall and pillar, and even from the roof? We shall learn the spiritual value of calm grays and the mellowings of time some day, perhaps. Mr. Page is an artist, and this is a paper he read before a New Hampshire school institute in his capacity as a member of the Boston school committee.

### ABOUT BOOKS AND WRITERS.

Professor Woodrow Wilson, of Princeton, may not belong to the "Puddenhead Wilson" family, but he is doing a foolish thing in over-writing himself. His work on "The State," good as it is, demands all his spare time until its inaccuracies and slipshod passages have been overhauled. He has himself been overhauled somewhat rudely by the reviewers. His recent book on "Mere Literature," so said the New York Times, "reveals the secret of his own weakness as a historian." His more recent "Life of Washington" tempted the Critic to complain that his style "o'erleaps itself, and falls on the other side." The constant iteration of 'tis, 'twas and 'twould becomes wearisome, and there are bits of corrupt journalistic English that shock and displease."

\*.\*

Another critic takes Prof. Wilson to task for placing a premature halo around Mr. Cleveland's head in the Atlantic Monthly. "He begins by asserting that 'it is much too early to attempt to assign to Mr. Cleveland his place in the history of our Government and policy,' in spite of which opinion Prof. Wilson attempts to do the very thing he declares to be impossible although his article itself proves the truth of his assertion." The panegyric is a composition of which a student might be prouder than a professor; but Mr. Cleveland, it should be remembered, is making his home in Princeton, and to the eyes of adoring faith bright visions are possible of third term-glories, with new Professor Wilsons stepping in the golden slipper footprints of the fortunate original.

\*.\*

The death of Henry Drummond at forty-six will surprise none who saw how he burnt his candle of life-devotion wantonly at both ends. The strange popularity of his quasi-scientific religious writings among the good people who need no aids to faith was one of many proofs that the most successful books, commercially, are those that appeal to what used to be called Sunday readers. Orthodoxy spiced with scientific or philosophic scepticism is now eagerly bought, whether in the form of essays, poems or stories. But the reverent scholarship which long sacrificed itself so freely to give the Drummonds and Maclarens their foothold, goes unread, unhonored and disowned by the popular vendors of a fashionable mixture.

\*.\*

An amusing novelty in the autograph-hunting line appears in Book News. Somebody in its name has been beguiling the writers of recently published books of no particular importance into telling their inquisitor what purposes they had in writing their books. Their replies fill a page or two of each number,

## PHILA. AND READING RY.

### ANTHRACITE COAL.

NO SMOKE. NO CINDERS.

On and after FEBRUARY 22, 1897.

Trains Leave Reading Terminal, Phila.

Buffalo Day Express	Via L. V. R. R.
Parlor and Dining Car	daily 9.00 A. M.
Black Diamond Express	week-days,
For Buffalo (Parlor Car)	12.30 P. M.
Buffalo and Chicago Express	daily 7.30 P. M.
Sleeping Cars	9.45 P. M.
Williamsport Express, week-days	8.35, 10.10
A. M. 4.05 P. M. Daily (Sleeper),	11.30 P. M.
Lock Haven, Clearfield and Bellefonte Express (Sleeper),	daily, except Saturday, 11.30 P. M.

### FOR NEW YORK.

Leave Reading Terminal, 7.30 (two-hour train), 8.30, 9.30, 10.30, 11.00 A. M., 12.45 (dining car), 1.30, 3.05, 4.00, 4.02, 5.00, 6.10, 8.10 (dining car) P. M., 12.05 night. Sundays—8.30, 9.30, 11.50 (dining car) A. M., 1.30, 3.55, 6.10, 8.10 (dining car) P. M., 12.05 night.

Leave 24th and Chestnut sts., 4.00, 11.04 A. M., 12.57 (dining car), 3.08, 4.10, 6.12, 8.19 (dining car), 11.58 P. M. Sundays—4.00 A. M., 12.04 (dining car), 4.10, 6.12, 8.19 (dining car), 11.58 P. M.

Leave New York, foot of Liberty street, 4.30, 8.00, 9.00, 10.00, 11.30 A. M., 1.30, 2.00, 3.30, 4.00 (two-hour train), 4.30 (two-hour train), 5.00, 6.00, 7.30, 9.00 P. M., 12.15 night. Sundays—4.30, 9.00, 10.00, 11.30 A. M., 2.00, 4.00, 5.00 P. M., 12.15 night.

Parlor cars on all day express trains and sleeping cars on night trains to and from New York.

FOR BETHLEHEM, EASTON AND POINTS IN LEHIGH AND WYOMING VALLEYS, 6.05, 8.00, 9.00, 11.00 A. M., 12.30, 2.00, 4.30, 5.30, 7.30, 9.45 P. M. Sundays—6.25, 8.32, 9.00 A. M., 1.10, 4.20, 7.30, 9.45 P. M. (9.45 P. M. does not connect for Easton.)

### FOR SCHUYLKILL VALLEY POINTS.

For Phoenixville and Pottstown—Express, 8.35, 10.10 A. M., 12.45, 4.05, 6.30, 11.30 P. M. Accom., 4.20, 7.45, 11.05 A. M., 1.42, 4.35, 5.53, 7.20 P. M. Sundays—Express, 4.00, 9.05 A. M., 11.30 P. M. Accom., 7.00, 11.35 A. M., 6.15 P. M.

For Reading—Express, 8.35, 10.10 A. M., 12.45, 4.05, 6.30, 11.30 P. M. Accom., 4.20, 7.45 A. M., 1.42, 4.35, 5.53, 7.20 P. M. Sundays—Express, 4.00, 9.05 A. M., 11.30 P. M. Accom., 7.00 A. M., 6.15 P. M.

For Chambersburg—Week-days—8.35 A. M. 4.05 P. M.

For Gettysburg, 8.35, 10.10 A. M.

For Pottsville—Express, 8.35, 10.10 A. M., 4.0, 6.30, 11.30 P. M. Accom., 4.20, 7.45 A. M., 1.42 P. M. Sundays—Express, 4.00, 9.05 A. M., 11.30 P. M. Accom., 7.00 A. M., 6.15 P. M.

For Shamokin and Williamsport—Express, 8.35, 10.10 A. M., 4.05, 11.30 P. M. Sundays—Express, 9.05 A. M., 11.30 P. M. Additional for Shamokin—Express, week-days, 6.30 P. M. Accom., 4.20 A. M. Sundays—Express, 4.00 A. M.

For Danville and Bloomsburg, 10.10 A. M.

### FOR ATLANTIC CITY.

Leave Chestnut street and South street wharves: Week-days—Express, 9.00 A. M., 2.00, 4.00, 8.00 P. M. Accom., 8.00 A. M., 6.30 P. M. Sundays—Express, 9.00, 10.00 A. M. Accom., 8.00 A. M., 4.45 P. M.

Parlor cars on all express trains.

Lakewood, week-days, 8.00 A. M., 4.15 P. M.

### FOR CAPE MAY AND SEA ISLE CITY.

Week-days, 9.45 A. M. For Cape May only, 4.15 P. M.

Detailed time tables at ticket offices, northeast cor. Broad and Chestnut, 533 Chestnut street, 1005 Chestnut street, 609 South Third street, 3963 Market street and at stations.

Union Transfer Company will call for and check baggage from hotels and residences.

1897

## KEATING BICYCLES

Tasty Design, Improvements, Skilled Workmanship, are all Visible

Interested? If so, send your address to

KEATING WHEEL CO.

821 Arch St.

PHILA.

or Factory, Middletown, Ct.

Please mention The American.



which saves money, and as their famous signatures are given in *fac simile*, they feel handsomely flattered, and get a cheap advertisement to boot. Their deficiency in humorous perception leads these poor people to take the universe quite seriously into their confidence, assuring it that their cook-books, little poetry books and hashed-up editorials were all inspired by the sublime desire to ennoble this generation, and give posterity a friendly lift toward the angelic. One only, the Rev. Dr. Lorimer, is man enough to confess, "I will not disguise, however, the fact that I am hoping for some profitable return from the venture."

\*\*\*

Dr. Donaldson Smith's book on his African adventures receives general praise, with the single exception of the *London Chronicle*, a hysterical voice wailing in the wilderness over the hopeless demoralization of the Liberal party. It finds temporary relief in abusing the American explorer, who presumed to rival Englishmen in bravery and outdid them in humane and generous dealings with the natives. We hope to give some account of the book shortly.

\*\*\*

The literary succession is to be perpetuated in our Embassy to England. Colonel John Hay is better known over there as a racy balladist of the Bret Harte type than as either a historian, biographer, poet or politician. The English tributes to Ambassador Bayard are being capped by the American colony in England, who are going to give him a loving-cup made of American gold and silver.

\*\*\*

Two manuscripts in the handwriting of Keats were bought last week for \$5,000 at auction for an American collector. No manuscript of this century is worth this preposterous sum. Sheer vanity, nothing else.

\*\*\*

A book, entitled "America and the Americans," has been much reviewed and quoted of late. It purports to be by an anonymous Frenchman, and his carefully-polished epigrams, criticising our social characteristics, have been hailed as essentially French. It is not much of a secret, however, that the book was written by an American, a New Yorker, a literary man, in all probability an employee of the publishers of the book, namely, Mr. Brownell, of Scribner's, whose masterly articles on French traits recently attracted notice in the magazine.

\*\*\*

This is from *Book News*: "Phroso," Mr. Anthony Hope's last, follows the sound instructions I once heard from the editor of a "Saturday night story-paper"—to make them young, one dark and the other light, put in difficulties and have something happen every one thousand words. All this Mr. Hope has done; but it is hard to see that he has done anything else in this romance of an English lord on a Greek island, with a fair maiden, Turks and brigands.

\*\*\*

Max Müller tells this about Tennyson: We lived in a small house in High street, nearly opposite Magdalen College, and our establishment was not calculated to receive sudden guests, particularly a Poet Laureate. He stepped in one day during the long vacation, when Oxford was almost empty. Wishing to show the great man all civility, we asked him to dinner that night and breakfast the next morning. At that time almost all the shops were in the market, which closed at one o'clock. My wife, a young housekeeper, did her best for our unexpected guest. He was known to be a gourmand, and at dinner he was evidently put out by finding the sauce with the salmon was not the one he preferred. He was pleased, however, with the wing of a chicken, and said it was the only advantage he got from being Poet Laureate, that he generally received the liver-wing of a chicken. The next morning at breakfast, we had rather plumed ourselves on having been able to get a dish of cutlets, and were not a little surprised, when our guest arrived, to see him whip off the cover of the hot dish, and to hear the exclamation, "Mutton chops! the staple of every bad inn in England!" However, these were but minor matters, though not without importance in the eyes of a young wife to whom Tennyson had been like one of the Immortals.

\*\*\*

The story of Grant's life as a farmer and business man in Missouri, after he had resigned from the Army and before the

Civil War, will be related by Hamlin Garland in *McClure's Magazine* for April. A considerable part of it will be personal recollections of Grant by Mrs. Boggs, in whose house he lodged for a time and whose husband was his partner in the real estate business in St. Louis.

\*\*\*

*Pioneers of Evolution*, from Thales to Huxley, by Edward Clodd, is the title of a remarkable work which will be published shortly by D. Appleton & Co. This book attempts to tell the story of the origin of the Evolution idea in the works of the ancient philosophers and its elaboration by Lucretius; its eclipse during the middle ages under the supremacy of the ecclesiastical dogmas; and its renaissance about A. D. 1600, under the influence of discovery and Lord Bacon's philosophy.

\*\*\*

In *The Bookman* there is a letter of Ruskin on Emerson, and one of Emerson on Ruskin. The two met at Oxford, and Ruskin wrote: "Emerson came to my rooms a day or two ago. I found his mind a total blank on matters of art, and had a fearful sense of the whole being of him as a gentle cloud—intangible." Then Emerson wrote to a friend: "He had seen Ruskin at Oxford, had been charmed by his manner in the lecture room, but in talking with him at his rooms had found himself wholly out of sympathy with Ruskin's views of life and the world. I wonder such a genius can be possessed by so black a devil. I cannot pardon him for a despondency so deep. It is detestable in a man of such powers, in a poet, a seer such as he has been. Children are right with their everlasting hope. Timon is always inevitably wrong." Carlyle, it may be remembered, took Emerson to the House of Commons, and he was pleased. Then he showed the philosopher the slums of London, and even then the Concord sage could see no turpitude in man, whereupon Carlyle lost his temper.

## The Last Chance

TO GET

### A Map and Chart Free.

*Neely's Historical Chart, Political and United States Map Combined.*

By an arrangement with the publishers of this excellent map and comprehensive chart, worth \$5, we are able to give it to our subscribers.

#### A PARTIAL DESCRIPTION.

Printed on both sides and completely reversible; 3 ft. 10 in. by 5 ft. 6 in., mounted on rollers. Rand, McNally & Co.'s map of the United States covers the entire back. The front contains diagrams showing all Political Parties of the United States, and the political complexion of each Congress; the Creeds of the world; the standing armies of each nation; the solar system, etc. Also, a complete map of the world, and maps of Central America, Alaska, South Africa, Central Asia, etc. Gives in brief the history of Politics and Political Parties of the United States from the beginning; an analysis of the Federal Government; valuable statistics, etc.

#### HOW TO GET MAP.

Sent, express prepaid, to subscribers to "THE AMERICAN" new or old, upon receipt of regular subscription price, \$2.

Sent absolutely free, express prepaid, to any one procuring one new subscriber to "THE AMERICAN" at \$2.

*Do not fail to name your nearest express office.*

The above is open for a very limited time only; therefore, all who desire to avail of the exceptional opportunity now presented, must send their orders and remittances without any delay to

## THE AMERICAN,

P. O. Box, 1202.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Here is a warning for all devotees of sensationalism. The news of Munkacsy's insanity is confirmed. The trouble at first was melancholia, but this was followed by something like homicidal mania. It is said he ornamented wooden boxes with colors at the beginning of his career. His father was a carpenter.

#### NOTES AND QUERIES FOR THOSE WHO TRAVEL.

ASCENDING THE HIGHEST PEAK OF THE ANDES. (TWENTY-FOUR THOUSAND FEET HIGH). The highest mountain of the American Andes, Aconcagua, has been ascended. On January 14th Zurbriggen, the Swiss guide of the Fitzgerald Expedition, stood on the summit, an elevation of more than 24,000 feet above sea level. He has thus anticipated the feat upon which Mr. Fitzgerald had set his heart, and for the accomplishment of which he organized the expedition. The difficulties of the ascent were numerous. The cold was intense, and apparently interminable slopes of snow stretched upward and mocked the hopes of the weary climbers. But this was not all. "Mountain sickness," due to the thinness of the air, also tested their physical powers and endurance. It must be a great mortification to Mr. Fitzgerald that the superior physical powers of his guide carried him to the summit before his courageous leader, but illness for a time, forbade further struggle on the part of the latter.

Mr. Fitzgerald and his party set out for the ascent of the mountain on December 23d, expecting to reach the summit four days later. On the 25th the party bivouacked at an elevation of 19,000 feet, on the neck of the mountain in a gale of wind and snow. All suffered from sickness and the intense cold. Next day two porters had to be sent back ill. Zurbriggen, whilst prospecting around, found Gussfeldt's card in a tin box, dated March, 1883. This was at a height of 21,000 feet. The Russian furnace, upon which so much of the comfort of the party depended, would not act, and exploded. Thenceforth, there was no hot food, which was a serious deprivation, and this want forced the party to descend to the valley on the 27th. There they remained three days to recruit, meanwhile sending up wood and water to the neck of the mountain in readiness for another attack. On the 30th they braced themselves for a second attempt. The boiling thermometers were useless, for they were not rated high enough. During three days the lowest temperature was five degrees Fahrenheit; the highest, in the sun, 26.46. On the 31st they were struggling painfully upward, and Zurbriggen's feet became frosted. They had to halt for two hours in consequence. After constant rubbing they succeeded in restoring circulation. Struggling upward, a height of 22,500 feet was reached, and then exhausted nature gave in. They returned on January 2d to the starting point to recruit. On the 9th they made a third attack on the mountain, the cold then being intense. On the 14th a height of 23,000 feet was gained, and there, unfortunately, Mr. Fitzgerald had to turn back ill, when only about 1,000 feet from the summit. It was very mortifying. Zurbriggen continued the ascent, and stood on the apex at five o'clock.

Zurbriggen's feat crowns all similar achievements. Humboldt, in 1802, climbed Chimborazo (19,000 feet), and in 1880 was followed by Mr. Whymper, whose record as a climber is familiar to all. Among the Himalayas, in 1892, Sir Martin Conway climbed Pioneer Peak, estimated at 22,000 feet, and Mr. Mummery and Mr. Hastings reached 21,000 feet on Nanga-Parbat. Only a very sanguine climber can indulge in the hope of scaling Mount Everest (29,000 feet), and Dapsang (28,700) feet, which tower above the giants of the Himalayas.

\*\*\*

TEMPTING SPRING OUTINGS. Very enticing to any who are free to exchange wintry streets for open country and welcome sunshine are the announcements of Messrs. Raymond & Whitcomb's annual spring tours to the Pacific Coast, Alaska, the Yellowstone National Park, etc. The date of leaving Philadelphia is Tuesday, April 20. These tours have been very popular for seventeen years past, and in no way, and at no time, can the scenic wonders of the mid-continent and the picturesque Pacific Coast be seen to better advantage. The trip can be made long or short, as desired, and the passengers are personally conducted through all the different journeys, so that they are relieved of all the ordinary cares of travelling. Alaska, and the marvelous Yellowstone Park region are, of course, prominent among the objective points. Messrs. Raymond & Whitcomb will send a descriptive circular on application. Their address is 1005 Chestnut street, Philadelphia.

**CCC LOOK TIRED THIS MORNING**



**W**AS it your own baby or your neighbor's that drove sweet sleep away? It's all unnecessary. Cascarets Candy Cathartic, sweet to the taste, mild but effective, stop sour stomach and colic in babies, and make papa's liver lively, tone his intestines and purify his blood.

**EAT CASCARETS LIKE CANDY**

They perfume the breath and make things all right all around. At your druggist's 10c., 25c., 50c., or mailed for price. Address

STERLING REMEDY COMPANY, CHICAGO OR NEW YORK.



**CANDY CATHARTIC**

CURE CONSTIPATION.

### ✿ Brown's Skirt Fastener ✿

Our "T" does it.



WITHOUT

is not made of metal. By its use the most stylish dress is made as comfortable as a house gown. No aching back, no open vents, no sagging skirts. Ask your merchant or dressmaker to show it to you.



WITH

... Manufactured by ...

### BROWN'S SKIRT FASTENER CO.

S. E. Cor. Second and Spruce Streets,

Philadelphia, Pa.

### RAYMOND & WHITCOMB'S TOURS.

ALL TRAVELING EXPENSES INCLUDED.

Parties will leave Philadelphia April 20 for Grand and Comprehensive Tours (personally escorted throughout) to

**COLORADO, CALIFORNIA, THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST, ALASKA AND THE YELLOWSTONE PARK, The Wonderland of America.**

Alaska (omitting California) May 27.  
Yellowstone National Park Tours, June 3, July 15 and 29.  
European Tours, March 27, May 4, 15, 19, June 9 and 28.  
Independent Railroad and Steamship Tickets to all points.  
Send for descriptive book, mentioning the particular trip desired.

RAYMOND & WHITCOMB,  
1005 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia,

### BOUND VOLUMES OF THE AMERICAN.

A very limited number, each covering 6 months, for years 1895 and 1896, are offered at \$2.50 per volume, express prepaid. If any particular volume is desired, please specify which. Orders must be subject to prior sale.

THE AMERICAN ✿

✿ P. O. Box 1202, Philadelphia.

Who builds Ruling Machines for Stone or Glass Ruling? Between 30 centimeters and one meter. Either for hand or machine work. Who will give us the above information? Address to A. Z. 750, c/o Rudolph Mosse, Frankfurt a/M-Germany.

**- Don't Push -**

**THEY RUN EASY**





**Columbia Bicycles**

**Unequalled, Unapproached. STANDARD OF THE WORLD.**

**\$100 to all alike.**

POPE MFG. CO., Hartford, Conn.  
Catalogue free from dealers or by mail for one 2-cent stamp.